

MAR 1 1913

VOL. XLIV, 1

WHOLE No. 173

THE
AMERICAN
JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

Founded by B. L. GILDERSLEEVE

EDITED BY

CHARLES WILLIAM EMIL MILLER

PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

WITH THE COÖPERATION OF

MAURICE BLOOMFIELD, HERMANN COLLATZ, TENNEY FRANK,
WILFRED P. MUSTARD, D. M. ROBINSON

JANUARY, FEBRUARY, MARCH

1913

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

Entered as second-class matter October 16, 1911, at the postoffice at Baltimore, Maryland, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1105, Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized on July 2, 1918.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
I.—Tibullus and Ovid. By R. S. RADFORD,	1
II.— <i>Voluntas Fati</i> in Latin Syntax. By ROBERT G. NISBET,	27
III.—The Second Necyia Again. By SAMUEL E. BASSETT,	44
IV.—On the Appendix Vergiliana. By W. M. LINDSAY,	53
V.—The Ion of Euripides. By J. E. HARRY,	56
VI.—Notes on Horace's Sermones. By CHARLES KNAPP,	62
VII.—Vossianus Q 86 and Reginensis 333. By GRACE FRANK,	67
VIII.—Dravidian Z. By EDWIN H. TUTTLE,	71
REPORTS:	73
Hermes, Vol. LVI (1921)—Philologus, Vol. LXXVII (1921).	
REVIEWS:	86
KLINGNER'S <i>De Consolatione Philosophiae</i> (E. K. Rand).—SALONIUS' <i>Vitae Patrum; Passio S. Perpetuae</i> ; <i>Die Ursachen der Geschlechtsverschiedenheit von dies</i> (Charles U. Clark).—ZABUGHIN'S <i>Vergilio nel Rinascimento Italiano</i> ; FERRI'S <i>Basini Parmensis Poetae Liber Isottaus</i> ; GALLETIER'S (P. Vergili Maronis) <i>Epigrammata et Priapea</i> ; <i>Étude sur la poésie funéraire romaine d'après les inscriptions</i> ; ELMER TRUESDELL MERRILL'S <i>C. Plini Caccili Secundi Epistularum libri decem</i> (W. P. Mustard).	
CORRESPONDENCE,	92
BOOKS RECEIVED,	94

The American Journal of Philology is open to original communications in all departments of philology—classical, comparative, oriental, modern; condensed reports of current philological work; summaries of chief articles in the leading philological journals of Europe; reviews by specialists; bibliographical lists. It is published quarterly. Four numbers constitute a volume, one volume each year. Subscription price, \$6.00 a year, payable in advance (foreign postage, 50 cents, extra); single numbers, \$1.50 each.

Articles intended for publication in the Journal, books for review, and other editorial communications should be addressed to the Editor, Professor C. W. E. Miller, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.

Subscriptions, remittances and business communications should be sent to

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, Baltimore, Md.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XLIV, 1

WHOLE No. 173

I.—TIBULLUS AND OVID:

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE SULPICIA AND CORNUTUS ELEGIES
IN THE TIBULLAN CORPUS.

PART I.

I. *Introduction.*

In two articles published in the *Transactions of the American Philological Association*,¹ I have sought to show that the whole Tibullan Appendix—including also the second, third and fifth elegies of Book II—as well as the whole Vergilian Appendix, including the great *Priapea*, are the youthful productions of Ovid, composed by him in the period extending from 27 to 8 B. C. These conclusions are based partly upon a study of the schemata and the metrical development, and partly upon the use of Burman's long neglected Index to Ovid, and they agree entirely with the results gained by Gruppe,² Kleemann³ and Némethy;⁴ they are also the only rational interpretation of the facts which have been set forth in elaborate dissertations by Ehrengreuber⁵ and Holtschmidt.⁶ It is now established beyond

¹ LI (1920), 146-171, "The Juvenile Works of Ovid and the Spondaic Period of his Metrical Art," and LII (1921), 148-177, "The *Priapea* and the Vergilian Appendix."

² *Röm. Elegie*, Leipzig, 1838, 105-143.

³ *De libri III carminibus quae Tibulli nom. circumferuntur*, Strassburg, 1876.

⁴ *De Ovidio elegiae in Messallam auctore*, Budapest, 1909.

⁵ *De panegyrico Messallae pseudo-Tib.*, partes I-X, Kremsmünster, 1889-92, 1894-99.

⁶ *De Culicis Sermone*, Marburg, 1913. A brief recent discussion, I

question that Ovid—like Catullus, like Propertius and like Tibullus in his first book—composed originally in spondees, and that the marvellously light and graceful dactylic verse which we now find in his received works was not a miraculous endowment of his youth, but the result of full twenty years of unremitting labor and study. In particular, the first edition of the *Amores*, consisting of five books, which was published after 15 B. C. and probably as late as 13-11 B. C., did not greatly exceed 48.5% of dactyls in the distich.⁷

The present article,—omitting only the *Panegyric* which has been so fully and elaborately treated by Ehrengruber—examines minutely the language and schemata of Book IV of the Tibullan corpus and of the second or Cornutus elegy of Book II.⁸ It

may add, showing in a striking manner the close connection between the Lygdamus poems, the *Culex*, the *Ciris* and Ovid, is that of H. Wagenvoort, *Mnemosyne* XLV (1917), 107-113. As to the *Moretum*, K. v. Reichenbach, *Die Echtheit des Mor.*, Znaim 1883, pp. 5, 9-10, shows clearly, but briefly, its Ovidian language. Plessis also (*Poésie Lat.* 277, n. 3) mentions with approval a "manuscript work by M. Lachèze" (a summary of which is given in the *Positions des mémoires présentés à la Fac. des Lettres de Paris*, 1907), which reaches the same conclusions, and expressly attributes the *Moretum* to Ovid. As to the *Ciris*, see below, n. 37.

⁷ Eight elegies of the present *Amores* (382 vss. in all), which have been only partially revised, show the spondees actually predominant in the hexameter lines as follows: I 15, 57.1%; II 4 and III 10, 53.1%; III 8, 53%; II 8, 51.8%; I 13, 51.2%; I 2, 51.0%; II 11, 50.9%. The youthful *Halieutica* shows 57.2% of spondees, v. further *op. cit.* (1920), 169.

⁸ II 2 must be joined to the Sulpicia elegies (IV 2-6), of which it is the natural and expected conclusion, and after marriage the lover 'Cerinthus' is given his true name of Cornutus; v. Gruppe, *op. cit.* 64, 68, 93; Zingerle, *Kl. philol. Abh.* I 22 f.; Ribbeck, *Röm. Dicht.* II 196; Knappe, *De Tibulli lib. IV elegiis*, Duderstadt, 1880, pp. 6 f., 19; Némethy, *Tib.* 49, 328-330; K. F. Smith, *Tib.* 86; Teuffel, *Studien u. Charakteristiken*, Leipzig 1871, p. 368; Plessis, *Poésie Lat.* 377 f.; Belling, *Albius Tibullus*, Berlin 1897, pp. 295 ff. Belling even argues (p. 298) that the 'editor' of the whole Corpus inserted a note to the effect that Cornutus is = Cerinthus, and that the archetype gave 'Cerinthe' at II 2, 9 and 3, 1 as a marginal or interlinear reading. The agreement in phraseology between II 2 and IV 2 has often been noted, e. g. by Némethy, 329, 334; Belling, 296; Bürger, *Hermes*, XL 329. The agreement of II 2 in length with the Sulpicia elegies is also very striking. The relation of II 2 to these elegies is also discussed

thus fulfills the promise of presenting overwhelming proof of the Ovidian authorship, which was made in my former articles, and gives—just as the Ehrengreuber and Holtschmidt dissertations give—an example of what may be expected from the detailed treatment of the language of [Tib.] II 5 and 3, and also of the *Ciris*, *Aetna*, *Catalepton*, *Priapea*, etc.; *ab uno disce omnes*. The principal poems which we shall examine are the Sulpicia Elegies and Letters; these have already been discussed by well-known critics with some very valuable results, but before I speak of these results in detail, I wish to mention briefly certain questions which relate to the whole Appendix.

II. The 'Imitations' or 'Playful Forgeries' Contained in Books IV and II.

The third and fourth books (if we may be allowed, for purposes of convenience, to retain the erroneous modern division) are far from being the only works of Ovid contained in the Tibullan corpus. The desperate condition of the second or posthumous book has long been well known, and for nearly a century a multitude of scholars have clearly recognized that the whole of this book cannot possibly be the genuine production of Tibullus. Gruppe, who discussed the problem—after Scaliger and Heyne—with even more than his usual acumen (*op. cit.* 69-101), proposed to remedy the most serious difficulties which present themselves (1) by transferring the elegy II 2 to Book IV, where it clearly belongs, and (2) by assuming that enormous interpolations—namely II 3, 35-58 and II 5, 23-38 and 66-78—were introduced into the two elegies, II 3 and II 5, after the death of Tibullus. Gruppe's view of II 2 has been very generally approved; many of the best Tibullan scholars, such as Baehrens, Korn, and Bubendey, have also substantially accepted his second solution (v. Baehrens, *Tib.*

at length by Ullrich, "De libri secundi Tibull. statu integro," *Fleckeis. Jahrb. Supplementbd.* XVII [1890], 448-460, but very unsuccessfully, since his whole thesis relating to the publication of the second book during the lifetime of Tibullus is a mistaken one and is rejected by most Tibullan scholars, e. g. Magnus, *Berl. philol. Wochenschr.* 1890, col. 600, and Hiller, *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 1890, col. 1087; other scholars holding the same view are named in the references of Cartault, *Corpus Tibull.*, Paris 1906, p. 568.

Blätter 24), but W. Wisser in an elaborate program, which is devoted entirely to the arrangement and composition of the great Messalinus or national elegy,⁹ reached the following correct conclusions respecting II 5: (1) That the development of the thought in this poem is wholly foreign to Tibullus; (2) that, in a certain technical sense, the composition throughout is immature and even bad; (3) that, in spite of the free employment of the names of Tibullus and Nemesis, the poem is wholly spurious and no part of it proceeds from Tibullus.¹⁰ The elegy II 3 has been discussed especially by Gruppe, Francken, Wilhelm and Belling; like II 2, it is addressed to Cornutus (Cerinthus) and therefore also "stands in a definite relation to the Sulpicia elegies" (cf. Zingerle, *Abh.* I 23). Belling's discussion (*Albius Tibullus*, pp. 79-81, 268-291) of this "rhetorical elegy," as he well terms it, deserves the highest praise and is more acute and searching than that of any of his predecessors; he recognizes clearly the closest kind of connection as existing between II 3 and II 2, on the one hand, and the Sulpicia elegies, on the other, and correctly assumes (pp. 291-303) the appearance in the Cornutus and Sulpicia poems of "a new phase of the poet's composition, a Cornutus-Sulpicia period"; to this group he joins also (p. 383) IV 13 and 14. The evidence of the language is conclusive, I may add, respecting the actual Ovidian origin of II 3. We possess four effective criteria for distinguishing the genuine poems and the playful 'forgeries.'¹¹ These are (1) the composition and the development of the thought, (2) the metre, (3) the language, and (4) the character of the mythology. Three of the elegies of the second book, namely 1, 4, and 6, exhibit the matured dactylic art of Tibullus and are apparently genuine; for they attain a marvellous virtuosity in

⁹ 'Ueber Tibull. II 5,' Eutin 1874. A very inadequate summary of Wisser's program is given by Cartault, *Corpus Tibull.* 258.

¹⁰ Hartung also, *De Panegyrico*, pp. 31, 44, &c., always refers to II 5 as the 'suspected elegy'; cf. also Ehr. I 29, 35; II 34. I may add that the writer of II 5 clearly had before him the complete *Aeneid* and very possibly also Propertius' fourth book; wholly unlike the genuine Tibullus, he also possessed all the recondite learning of Alexandria and of later Greece.

¹¹ "The reader must not, however, feel all the moral indignation that the term forgery is likely now to produce."—Fay on the forged Elogium Duilianum, *Class. Phil.* XV (1920), 176.

the distich, which ranges from 55 to 57%,¹² and which Ovid himself was able to achieve only in the works published after 8 B. C., that is, in the *Heroides*, the *Ars* and the second *Amores*. One elegy, II 5, is so heavily spondaic—showing only 46.7% of dactyls—that this feature alone subjects it to the gravest suspicion; ¹³ two elegies exhibit an equal ratio (50%), and may, so far as regards the application of this one test, possibly be genuine, but the evidence of the language and the mythology easily shows that both are spurious.

As is well known, our extant manuscripts of Tibullus, which are all of late date (saec. XIV or XV), divide the Tibullan corpus into three books; the usual or traditional division into four books, which is due to the Italian scholars of the fifteenth century, is entirely without authority in the text tradition and is retained only for the sake of convenience. It is doubtful, however, whether even the three-book division is correct. For Ullrich, who has carefully discussed this whole question (*Studia Tib.: De libri II. editione*, Berlin, 1889, pp. 58-74), reaches the conclusion that, in all probability, there were originally only 'two books of Tibullus.' Thus the *Excerpta Parisina* (saec. XI or XII), which are considerably older and better than our extant manuscripts, after quoting verses found in the *Nemesis* book as "*in secundo*," cite, no less than fifteen times, verses of the *Lygdamus* poems as "*in eodem (sc. in secundo)*." Also a library catalogue of the ninth century published by M. Haupt (*Opusc.* III, 2, 426) enumerates only 'two books of Tibullus' ("*Albi Tibulli lib. II*"). In Ullrich's view then (p. 69), just as we owe the four-book division to the Italian scholars, so at the close of the middle ages the fourteenth-century copyists have introduced into our manuscripts, for the sake of convenience, the division into three books.¹⁴ A similar conclusion is reached by Leonhard, *De codicibus Tibull.*, Monachii 1882, p. 53.

¹² II 1 shows 55.2% of dactyls in the distich, II 4 55.0%, II 6 56.8%.

¹³ The high percentage of spondees in the first foot also indicates that both II 5 and II 3 are spurious.

¹⁴ Ullrich's exact view (pp. 68 f.) is that there was a first edition of Tibullus consisting of two books, both of them published in the poet's lifetime, but that we now possess a second edition prepared by a late editor, whom he (erroneously) supposes to have lived after the period of Martial. This editor, he holds, has not added a third book to the collection, but has affixed a 'formless appendix' to the second book,

Lucian Müller (*Praef. Tib. VI*), on the other hand, assumes that the older manuscripts have omitted by mistake the marks of division before the Lygdamus poems. Cartault also (*Tibulle* 69) argues that the *Excerpta Parisina*, in citing the first two extracts from Book III, namely 1, 7 and 2, 6, have forgotten to add "*in tertio*," and when, beginning with the third extract (3, 11), they have "*in eodem*," they are really referring to this omitted subscription. He further holds (*Corpus Tibull.* 223, 352) that the ninth-century catalogue is either inaccurate in its figures or relates to an incomplete manuscript. In any case, believing 'Lygdamus' to be the editor of our present Corpus, Cartault fully admits (*Tibulle* 89) the "possibility that the second book has appeared only with the complete edition," which, in his view, contained the third book as an appendix. A similar conclusion is reached by Hiller (*Hermes XVIII* [1883], 352 f.), who maintains that all the apparent deviations from the three-book division of our extant manuscripts can be explained through the carelessness and error of the medieval copyists. The matter does not admit of final determination,¹⁵ but I myself incline to the three-book division as more fully attested, and am disposed to believe that the editor of our Corpus (Ovid) has probably devoted one book to the poems of Tibullus alone, a second to a mixed collection, and a third exclusively to his own productions. In order to constitute the second book, Ovid was compelled to add three elegies of his own, comprising 224 verses; even with this addition, the posthumous book, with only 428 lines in all, "has a strikingly small size in comparison with all the books of Roman poets that can justly

thus making the latter consist in all of 1111 verses. The view of Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen*, Berlin 1882, pp. 426 ff., whom Ullrich has closely followed, is essentially the same, except that Ullrich makes the 'appendix' begin with the Lygdamus poems, while Birt, finding the present second book of 428 verses unduly and abnormally short, adds to it the 290 verses of the Lygdamus poems and so makes the 'appendix' begin with the *Panegyricus Messallae*, whose separate title is guaranteed by the *Excerpta Parisina*.

¹⁵ Cf. Schanz, *Röm. Litt.* § 278, p. 221, who speaks of the editor as "having added all that he found as a third roll to the two already known Tibullan books," yet adds: "It would also be conceivable that he united all with the short second book, and certain excerpts . . . seem to point to such a book-division."

be cited" (Hiller; *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 1890, col. 1087), and bears convincing testimony to the existence of peculiar and unusual circumstances.¹⁶

It is quite impossible to say whether we possess in our extant corpus all the works of Tibullus or not. It is well known that the first book was published *after* the triumph of Messalla in September, 27 B.C.; we ourselves hold with Baehrens (*Tib. Blätter* 24) that the actual date of publication, however, was nearer 25 or 24 B.C.¹⁷ In 23 B.C. Horace (*C. I* 33) speaks of our poet as "addressing mournful elegies to Glycera"; these may either be the Delia elegies of the first book, or they may very possibly be, as many scholars maintain (cf. Ullrich, p. 46), poems which have been lost and which were not included by the editor in our present corpus; we have no possible means of determining the question definitely.¹⁸ Nor yet can we determine

¹⁶ The well-known fact that Ovid's Sappho Epistle, which entirely lacks any ascription to an author, is usually found in Tibullus manuscripts (e. g. in the Guelferbytanus, but not in A and V), I regard at present of course as wholly accidental, but I have had no opportunity to examine more carefully into the matter, as I should have wished to do.

¹⁷ According to Cartault, *Tibulle* 89, it was in 26/25.

¹⁸ They certainly were not, as Schanz (§ 279, p. 221) and Ullman (*A. J. P.* XXXIII 152) think, the Nemesis elegies, since these latter show imitation of Propertius' third book and were therefore composed after 22 B.C. (Némethy, *Tib.*, p. 338; Belling, *op. cit.* 363 f.). They may well, however, have been different from the Delia elegies, for Hörschelmann's studies upon elision in Tib. (*Philologus*, 1897, pp. 354-371) imply, as he correctly concludes, a considerable difference between books I and II, or as Postgate (*Selections*, p. xxxiii) well phrases it, 'an appreciable interval of time between their composition.' The development of the dactylic virtuosity is a still more striking proof of this interval. Unlike the works of Propertius, the thirteen genuine elegies which we possess from Tibullus all show the unity of the distich and almost invariable dissyllabic closes in the pentameter. The earlier productions of Tibullus could not possibly have exhibited this finished form, and the poems therefore (such as I 10, 4, 8 &c.) which have come down to us from his more youthful period reach us doubtless only in a revision or a second edition. The principal purpose of Ovid was certainly not to publish the complete works of Tibullus, but to offer to the cultivated Roman public an artistic 'Tibullan volume' with elegant dissyllabic closes. If therefore he found among the papers of his predecessor any elegies with polysyllabic endings which Tib.

certainly whether the ancients, as is implied in Charisius' citation (I 87 Keil: 'implicuitque femur femini'), knew certain poems of Tibullus which we no longer possess (cf. Wisser, *Quaest. Tib.*, p. 18; Hiller, *Hermes* XVIII 353, n. 1; Schanz § 279, p. 221; Marx, Pauly-Wissowa, I 1327, s. v. Albius, and also the various references given by Cartault, *Corpus Tibull.* 569). In any case it is clear that Tibullus composed but little, and we need not be surprised that, upon his sudden death in 19 B. C., Ovid, when he was appointed literary executor by Messalla, could find among his papers only three elegies of 204 verses suitable for publication, namely II 1, 4 and 6. These were too few in number to constitute a poetical book, which, as Birt (*op. cit.* 291 ff.) has shown, should contain at least 500 verses.¹⁹

We come now to the publication of the three genuine elegies and of the whole Appendix. So far as relates to the 'Messalla Collection' alone, it has already been correctly perceived by Teuffel (*Stud. u. Charakt.* 1871, p. 382), by Postgate (*op. cit.* L), and by Cartault (edition, p. 89) that 'Lygdamus' (Ovid) was the actual editor. Since Ovid's poems occupy one-half of the second book (II 2, 3 and 5) and the remainder of the corpus, and since he expressly tells us (*Pont.* II 3, 75) that Messalla first induced him to "venture to commit his works to fame," we cannot doubt that it was with Messalla's express approval that he edited the three posthumous elegies and added his own early poems,—many of them devoted to the praise of his patron and his patron's family. We therefore regard as highly improbable the view prevalent since the time of Lachmann (cf. Schanz, *op. cit.* § 278, p. 220), that the Appendix was not issued until Messalla's death, because it unites the poems of Tibullus with

had not revised and which he himself found no time to correct, we may be sure that he unhesitatingly suppressed them. Ayrmann, in his once famous biography of Tibullus (*Vitebergae* 1719, p. 148), which is quoted by Cartault (*Corpus Tibull.* 37, n. 2), is by no means wholly wrong in his judgment at this point: "Non male colligas . . . eam, quam nunc habemus editionem, sive a Tibullo non longe ante ipsius obitum, sive, quod mihi probabilius videtur, post illum a Critico quodam curatam esse: in qua scilicet multae, quae puncta acutorum iudicium non tulerant, Elegiae omissae, aliae seorsum editae insertae, et integri forsan lib. III et IV primum adiecti fuerint."

¹⁹ *Monobibla*, or works without book-division, do not have this limitation, cf. Birt, p. 297.

foreign material. Publication, however, certainly did not occur at once, but was deferred until a favorable opportunity offered; for it was necessary that Ovid should first compose the choice and exquisite poems which give him the clearest right to take his place, in the circle of Messalla, beside the revered master and even to share in the elegant and harmonious 'Tibullan volume.'²⁰ The elegies IV 2-14 and II 2, 3 and 5 were therefore composed for an express purpose, and all alike are made truly 'Tibullan,' that is, they are made to conform to all (or nearly all) the principal rules of Tibullan art, such as the unity of the distich, the preference for dactyls, the limitation of elision, the figures produced by placing adj. and subst. in correlation, and,—in very large measure also,—to the simplicity and naturalness of Tibullan speech,²¹ without, however, its vagueness, its monotony, and its mechanical repetition. Especially noticeable is it that the extremely difficult refinement which requires the elegant dissyllable in the pentameter close, and which, because of its extreme difficulty, many of the best Roman poets (such as Martial and Ausonius) never fully adopted,²² is here taken up and carried to a degree of perfection exceeding that of Tibullus himself. Several striking facts cannot fail to arrest our attention here. The *Copa* in the 'Vergilian Appendix,' which, like the Sulpicia elegies (IV 2-6), imitates the fourth book of Propertius,²³ and like them, shows the early Ovidian schema SDSS predominant, does not observe the Tibullan rule of the dissyllable; it was not intended therefore for the 'Tibullan volume,' although it was composed about the same time as the Sulpicia elegies,—most probably, of course, shortly before them. It is evident then that it was very slowly and, we may add, in some respects, very reluctantly that the youthful Ovid abandoned the greater freedom and vigor of Catullus, Gallus and Proper-

²⁰ A certain apparent metrical uniformity, at least, pervades the whole volume, v. L. Müller, *praef. Tib.*, p. xxviii, and Zingerle, *Abh.* II 75.

²¹ Bürger, *Charites* 371-394; Knappe, *op. cit.* 12; K. F. Smith, 68.

²² Plessis, *Traité de métrique* §§ 134 f. and *Poésie Lat.* 275, n. 3, rightly maintains that the extent to which this refinement was actually adopted has been greatly exaggerated. Besides Tibullus, Ovid, and—in his latest elegies—Propertius, very few have ever conformed to this severe rule.

²³ This question is treated more fully below, see p. 20.

tius, in order to attain the uniform smoothness and the artistic precision of Tibullus.²⁴ Consequently his art long remained in an experimental stage, and the complete attainment of the Tibullan dissyllable, which is evident first in the *Consolatio* and the *Maecenas* (9 and 8 B. C.), was—just as the full achievement of the dactylic virtuosity—the work of many years. On the other hand, the heavy spondaic preponderance which appears in the Lygdamus elegies (III 1-6) shows clearly that they are a very early work, and the sequel of Neaera's divorce from the poet is actually given later in the poems of the 'Vergilian Appendix' (Catal. VI, XII, XIII)—a collection which completely disregards both the dissyllable and the unity of the distich.²⁵ It is evident therefore that the Lygdamus elegies, which were at first written quite independently, must originally have had polysyllabic and pre-Tibullan endings, but that they have been carefully revised in this respect with the purpose of fitting them to the Tibullan corpus.²⁶ The scrupulous artist

²⁴ Ovid possessed by nature great narrative and descriptive powers; therefore in early youth he dearly loved and long retained the simpler and more perspicuous word-orders; cf. *TAPA*. 1920, p. 151; Krafft, *De artibus quas Tib. et Lyg. in versibus, &c.*, pp. 10, 24. We cannot doubt then that he shed 'tears, idle tears' (*lacrimas inanes*) as he slowly turned away from nature to art and to the choice and elegant, though artificial, collocations and arrangements of words which, in the last analysis, the learning and genius of Ennius had imposed upon Rome; see my "Licensed Feet in Latin Verse," *Studies in Honor of Maurice Bloomfield* (New Haven, 1920), pp. 253 f. It is not surprising therefore that the conjunction *et*, which is postponed 36 times in Tib., suffers displacement only 20 times in the Tib. App.; see Streifinger, *De syntaxi Tib.*, Wirceburgi 1881, p. 40; Lierse, *Ueber die Unechtheit des dritten Tib. Buches* 27. Naeke (*Valerius Cato*, pp. 284-95) has noted this retention of the simple and normal order as characteristic also of the juvenile pieces of the Verg. App.

²⁵ The elegiac poems in the Verg. App. belong to the period of the Athenian journey and often have Greek originals; it is not surprising that they should retain Greek freedom and Greek flexibility in the treatment of the pentameter. Of later date seems to be the influence of Tibullus upon Ovid as upon "one born out of due time."

²⁶ This statement does not apply to the sixth poem, which did not form part of the booklet sent as a New Year's present to Neaera (Gruppe, *op. cit.* 119-123; Cartault, *Tibulle*, p. 70), but was written later and expressly for the Tibullan volume. Hence it shows a large dactylic percentage in the distich (46.4%), and Ehrenguber (*op. cit.*

who apologized for composing the epistle of Sappho, the lyric poetess, in elegiac verse (*Her.* 15, 5) and also for writing the invectives of the *Ibis* (*Ib.* 45) and the loftier themes of the *Fasti* (*Fast.* II 3 ff.; VI 2) in the same metre, and who, in II 5, purposely introduced one or two minor Tibullan refinements into his own metrical schemes,²⁷ was not likely to overlook propriety and consistency in the pentameter closes which strike even the eye. We know that, in a wholly similar way, the first *Amores* were later revised both with respect to pentameter closes and to dactylic virtuosity. We conclude therefore that the second and third books of our extant codices were probably published by Ovid at the authorization of Messalla subsequent to the fourth book of Propertius and to the *Copa*, i. e. about 14-13 B. C.²⁸ The whole Appendix was therefore completed when Ovid was twenty-nine or thirty, and it contains some of his most exquisite work, which he never afterwards surpassed. It affords us also a glimpse into the family circle of Messalla and presents us with a picture of the youthful poet more attractive than we possessed before or than we should form from the *Amores* alone.²⁹

X 5) correctly says that it is the only poem of Lygdamus (except the very short No. 2) which does not contravene Tibullan art in this respect.

²⁷ Namely, the avoidance of SD and the very free use of postponed *que*,—the latter a device, however, which at a later period is immensely common in the works published under his own name.

²⁸ Provided we assume the correctness of our present division of 'Tibullus' into three books, another theory would be possible perhaps, though extremely improbable. Baehrens (*Tib. Blätter* 53) who, like Plessis (*Poésie lat.* 369), so clearly perceived the close relation existing between the Tibullan and Vergilian Appendices, held that some grammarian of the age of Claudius had found by chance certain poems in the house of Messalla and united them into two different collections, putting into one those which reminded him of the style of Tibullus, and into the other those which were written more in Vergil's manner; "the public received favorably the matters presented under such favorite names and exercised no criticism." I hold, on the other hand, that Ovid himself published both the three posthumous elegies of Tibullus and the Tibullan Appendix; also that he prepared for publication, but suppressed, the other Appendix, a copy of which was later found in Cotta's house and published as Vergilian, see *Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.* 1921, p. 165.

²⁹ As stated above, the first edition of the *Amores* is probably not earlier than 13-11 B. C. Riese, in the fine Preface (p. vi) to his text

The Ovidian poems, whose inclusion in the volume was approved by Messalla, make as a rule no claim whatever to Tibullan authorship and are legitimately added to the volume as the work of a youthful admirer and disciple of the lamented Tibullus. A special case, however, is presented by the two poems already mentioned, namely II 5 and 3, and by IV 13. These latter are artistic 'imitations' or 'impersonations,' which assume the right to use freely the names of Tibullus and of Nemesis, and which therefore at first appear to have been actually written by Tibullus. They are in a certain sense 'forgeries' of a playful and innocent kind; their real authorship was doubtless well known within the small Messalla circle, but could not possibly have been known outside. We may properly direct our attention in the present paper chiefly to IV 13, the exquisite 'imitation' of Tibullus which has itself been imitated and admired by so many English poets.³⁰ The Tibullan authorship of this poem

of Ovid (Leipzig 1871), correctly holds, I think, that even the first *Amores* do not belong among the poet's early works; for after quoting the well-known passage upon "Corinna first awakening his genius" (*Trist.* 4, 10, 57 ff.), he aptly adds: "Ex quibus verbis cave ne hoc efficias, Amorum libros primos ab eo compositos esse; cum illud tantum dicere velit, gloriam se per eos primum sibi parasse." The view of Pohlenz (*De Ov. carm. amat.*, Göttingen 1913) that the first *Amores* appeared shortly after 19 B. C., seems to me wholly erroneous. However, if a first *Amores* is assumed more heavily weighed down with spondees and polysyllabic endings than I have hitherto contended for, the conjectural date may be made just as early as one pleases, except that the elegy I 14 referring to the Sygambri (B. C. 15) is shown by the 50% of spondees in its hexameters to belong to the first edition; note especially the spondaic vss. 45-49, which contain the reference!—In my former article (*Trans.* 1920, p. 147), it is possible that, in assuming the age of sixteen, I have given too early a date to the "first shaving of the beard" (*Trist.* 4, 10, 57), but in any case no one will question that Ovid was both a member of the circle of Messalla and was composing verse very freely at the age of twenty; cf. *Pont.* 2, 3, 71 f., and see Plessis, *Poésie Lat.* 422 f.; Hennig, *De Ovidii sodalibus*, Berlin 1883, p. 29.

³⁰ E. g., by Walsh, Cowley and Thomas Moore, perhaps also by Shakspeare; v. Smith on IV 13, 9-12 and in *A. J. P.* XXXVII (1916), 155. Wilhelm (*Rhein. Mus.* LIX [1904] 291) also thinks that Shakspeare owes to this poem the fine lines of the duke of Suffolk in Henry VI, Part II. III 2, v. 360 ff. Verses 11-12 are paraphrased by Cowley: "Thou from all shades the darkness canst exclude, | And from a desert

has been rejected in our own times by many critics, but the most weighty arguments against its authenticity have been advanced by Postgate,³¹ who here turns aside from the purely subjective and dilettant methods which characterize his criticism of the Lygdamus poems and, employing effectively all modern helps, shows himself one of the most acute and trustworthy of Tibullan scholars. It seems worth while, however, to point out that Postgate was not the first to perceive the 'forgery'; the learned English translator, James Grainger, brought forward, in his poetical version of 1757, serious objections against the ascription of the poem to Tibullus and even proposed Ovid as the author.³² The language of this piece is fully studied below and its Ovidian character shown.

banish solitude." They are also well translated by Williams: "Thou art my balm of care, in dark my day, | In wildest waste, society complete." V. 12 (. . . in solis tu mihi turba locis) is quoted CIL. 10, 378 (I. Inscr. R. N. n. 6374). Postgate's harsh judgment upon the merits of this elegy (as also in part that of Voss, Ehrengreuber, and Némethy upon the *Lygdamus*, *Panegyric* and *Ciris*) is to be explained by the principle enunciated by Ellis with respect to the *Elegies of Maximianus* (*A. J. P.* V 6): "It has always been and it is at the present day the fashion of scholars, when denouncing a forgery, to heap abuse and ridicule on the work with which the forger has been busied." Smith (p. 517) well says: "There are beautiful lines in this poem, lines, I may add, which appear to have had a longer and more vivid tradition in English poetry than anything else in the entire *Corpus Tibullianum*"; cf. also Schanz § 278, p. 220 and § 281, p. 229; Cartault, *Corpus Tibull.* 323; Gruppe, *op. cit.* 268; Belling, *Albius Tibullus* 383. Wilhelm, *op. cit.*, speaks of them as "*versus suavissimi, qui poetam in arte perfectum ostentare videntur*"; Martinon also (*Tibulle*, Paris 1895, XLVII), says: "Cette pièce est peut-être le chef-d'oeuvre du poète"; cf. Hennig, *Untersuchungen zu Tib.* 16.

³¹ *Journal of Philology* IX (1880), 280-285; *Selections*, pp. 191-199. Ehrengreuber likewise, *op. cit.* IX 61, argues that the poem contains too many elisions to be genuine; on the character of these elisions, see also Hörschelmann, *Philologus* 1897, pp. 358 f.

³² *Poetical Translations* II, p. 814: "Though the critics unanimously ascribed this elegy to Tibullus, yet did the translator think, that the thoughts had not that simplicity, which constitutes one of the characteristic beauties of our poet. And though Tibullus is mentioned in the poem, no argument can thence be drawn of its being the work of our poet, as in after-times, those who excelled in elegy affected to style themselves Tibullus."—P. 816: "Therefore, if Tibullus is the author, he either in this piece imitated Ovid, or the piece itself was

The six little Letters (IV 7-12) of Sulpicia, kinswoman of Messalla,³³ in which the lady undertakes the part of wooing the shy youth, Cerinthus, are also, as the language unmistakably shows, composed by Ovid himself,³⁴ though doubtless with the approval or consent of Sulpicia, who was naturally not averse to so obliging and so accomplished a secretary. These condensed

written by some body else, who was so fond of Tibullus, &c." Cf. also Postgate, *Selections*, p. 198: "Some member of the circle of Tibullus, an admirer both of him and of Propertius, wrote it to amuse himself or his friends, &c."

³³ The Greek pastorals which Messalla himself wrote upon a certain maiden or 'heroine' (*Catal.* 9, 13 f.) may possibly have suggested to Ovid the praise of Sulpicia in verse, cf. Baehrens, *Tib. Blätter* 46.

³⁴ As Gruppe (*Röm. El.* 27-64) so well pointed out, the love story of Sulpicia and Cerinthus is told in two versions, one version consisting of short letters (IV 8-12), the other of longer monologues (2-6). Many scholars in Gruppe's day wished to reject as spurious all the Sulpicia poems without exception, but Gruppe found a *via media*, generously giving up to Sulpicia the short letters, but retaining for Tibullus the longer elegies. Yet why, one may ask, should not one poet have composed both versions? (There are many 'doublets,' for example, in the Verg. App., and many in the *Metamorphoses*; cf. Schanz, § 304, p. 317.) Gruppe does not answer this question, and, with respect to one poem at least (IV 7), scholars have never been able to decide to which group it belongs! Upon this whole question, however, it will be sufficient to refer the reader to the long and ineffectual polemic of Belling (*Albius Tibullus*, 1-26) against Hennig; cf. also Hiller, *Hermes* XVIII 355. It is indeed the irony of fate that most critics should have indignantly repudiated the brilliant Lygdamus discovery of Gruppe, and have meekly accepted his erroneous Sulpicia solution. Knappe, however, (*op. cit.* 41) earnestly objects to Gruppe's ascription of these 'little letters' to Sulpicia, on the very good grounds, (1) that the amatory epistle written in verse (instead of prose) is always a literary device, (2) that Sulpicia, a modest maiden, could not possibly have used in IV 10 such obscene words as *scortum*, *toga*, &c.—The correspondences with the Sulpicia elegies which the Letters exhibited are well shown by Belling, *op. cit.*, 31-34. The judgment expressed by Heyne in his second edition (1777) upon their authorship, as reported by Cartault (*Corpus Tibull.* 69 f.), is so near the truth that it is worth quoting: "Heyne n'est pas sûr que celles même qui paraissent être de Sulpicia soient d'elle en réalité; elles peuvent avoir été faites par un poète parlant en son nom." Cartault himself, who does not like Gruppe especially well, calls Gruppe's supposed discovery "the great novelty of his book" (*op. cit.* 164, 549), and although he scarcely does full justice elsewhere to the gifted and brilliant author of the "*Römische Elegie*," he here becomes unduly favorable to him.

epigrams—necessarily a little difficult and obscure in view of their extreme brevity—are a wonderfully clever imitation of feminine psychology and foretoken the rare gift of impersonation shown in the *Heroides* and other later works. Unlike the *Heroides*, however, but wholly like the epistle of Arethusa in Propertius (IV 3), the situations and characters are not drawn from the mythical past, but from the immediate present and from real life.

From the time of Gruppe (*op. cit.* 49), of Teuffel (*Stud. u. Charakt.*, 1871, p. 366), and of Baehrens (*op. cit.* 42) these letters have been used to illustrate the theme of 'Feminine Latinity.'³⁵ Postgate, however (*Selections*, XLI), shrewdly speaks of this whole allegation as an unfounded 'calumny,' and Cartault (*Corp. Tibull.* 164, 179) declares the phrase 'Feminine Latin' (instead of 'colloquial Latin') to be unjust and misleading, in spite of the great popularity which it has achieved, while Smith (*Tib.* 81) discusses the 'feminine psychology' of the letters at length and pays a well-deserved tribute to the cleverness of their author when he writes: "In this respect nothing in all literature could be more characteristically feminine than these elegies. Their charming author is beyond all doubt a very woman. . . . She is feminine in what she says and in the way she says it."³⁶

A brief word may be said in conclusion respecting the special character of the 'imitations' of Tibullus and Vergil which have been composed by Ovid. Famous examples of pseudonymous and anonymous publication abound in literature,—we need only mention the finding in the temple of the book of the law (Deuteronomy) ascribed to Moses 621 B. C., or the recitation of the *Hymn to Apollo* by the Homeric rhapsode who impersonated Homer and introduced into his poem certain pretended reminiscences of Homer's life,³⁷ and, in modern times, the

³⁵ Cf. also Schanz § 284, p. 239, and Marx, Pauly-Wissowa, s. v. '*Albius*,' col. 1326.

³⁶ According to Cartault, *Corpus Tibull.* § 46. 12, p. 169, Hertzberg, in his review of Gruppe, at once called into question the pretended discovery of "Feminine Latinity"; see also Belling, pp. 70-72.

³⁷ This is the usual view of Homeric scholars, cf. Gilbert Murray, *Greek Lit.*, pp. 6, 53. On the whole subject of ancient "Pseudepigrapha," see the treatment of Birt in his *Kritik u. Hermeneutik*, pp.

Rowley poems in which, by a species of dramatic masquerade, Chatterton reproduced the rich pageantry and all the curious learning of the Middle Ages. Ovid, who was almost from the first a devoted disciple of Tibullus and of Vergil, and who, according to his own account (*Trist.* IV 10, 42), worshipped these poets as superior beings, composed, for the Tibullan volume which he edited, several poems of considerable length in the name of Tibullus and, at an earlier date, three or four very short pieces in which he playfully impersonated Vergil (*Catal.* VIII and XIV; cf. I and VII).⁸⁸ I may call especial attention, however, to a few extenuating circumstances connected with these imitations or, as some may prefer to call them, these playful forgeries: (1) The Tibullan pieces are apparently deliberate and intentional impersonations, but emphatically not harmful

222-242 (Müller's Handbuch I, 3, München 1913), which is very excellent in spite of occasional lapses and errors, such as the total misunderstanding (p. 231) of the *Halieutica*, which belongs to Ovid's early and formative period (*Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.* 1920, p. 163), and the genuineness of which has been so fully vindicated by Zingerle (*Abh.* II 1). Respecting the *Ciris* he speaks almost like a prophet (p. 240): "Ich glaube wie Ganzenmüller, dass die *Ciris* . . . unter Ovidischem Einfluss steht"; he then goes on to cite striking Ovidianisms, such as *quid enim* (vss. 71, 190, 334, 437, 513), *illa ego sum* (409, 411, 414), &c. (Very admirable also is his discussion of the *Culex* [pp. 232 ff.]). Birt is here wholly right in his praise of Ganzenmüller's great study upon the *Ciris* ("Beiträge zur *Ciris*," *Fleckeis. Jahrb. Supplementbd.* XX [1894], pp. 553-657), which shows most clearly the close relation in which this poem stands to Ovid; yet although Ganzenmüller's facts are indisputable, his conclusions—like those of Ehrenguber and Holtzschmidt—are sometimes technically erroneous. With a view to supplementing Ganzenmüller's splendid performance, Mr. R. F. Thomason, a graduate student of the University of Tennessee, has undertaken to examine the language and phraseology of the *Ciris* in detail. His dissertation is almost completed and will be published at an early date. I myself have in preparation brief articles upon the Lygdamus elegies and the *Panegyric* which are designed to supplement the dissertations of Kleemann and of Ehrenguber.

⁸⁸ So far as regards Tibullus, it would be difficult to prove, I think, that Ovid has really taken greater liberties with him than Plato took with Socrates or the unknown author of the Fourth Gospel took with the "beloved disciple reclining on the Master's bosom."—The Vergilian impersonations, we have a right to assume, were composed at about the same time as the metrical arguments to the books of the *Georgics* and of the *Aeneid* (*Anth. Lat.* 1. 2 Riese), cf. *Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.* 1921, p. 153.

ones, in any sense of the word. Ovid's attitude towards Tibullus especially was generous in the extreme. (2) In these imitations we can also see that Ovid was interested in writing for the joy of writing, and cared little for the splendor of fame or wealth which the performance might bring him. Niebuhr thought him "the only Roman who attained complete facility of versification," and in no case has it ever been more true than in his that "the poet does but speak because he must; he sings but as the linnets sing." Literature was the master-passion of his life. Even Tomi could not quell his buoyant and genial spirit,³⁹ and he poured forth his copious and melodious verse to the very end.⁴⁰ (3) There are very many forms of literary artifice and of dramatic masquerade to be seen in his works. Thus the *Amores* profess to deal with personal experience and to celebrate an actual mistress, Corinna, but in point of fact they are almost entirely the creation of poetic fancy and of literary study.⁴¹ The *Panegyric* professes (v. 122) to have been composed in 31 B. C. or very shortly afterwards, but this is a mere literary device; actually it was written many years later (cf. *Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.* 1920, p. 160). The elegy upon Messalla (*Catal.* IX) was probably written in 27 B. C. (cf. *Pont.* II 3, 79 f.), yet even of this we cannot be certain.⁴² The *Copa* and the second part of the *Maecenas* (v. 145 ff.) are also essentially dramatic impersonations, but in their case a brief

³⁹ Stat. *Silv.* I 2, 254 nec tristis in ipsis Naso Tomis.

⁴⁰ Cf. *Trist.* V 12, 59 nec tamen, ut verum fatear tibi, nostra teneri | A componendo carmine Musa potest. | Scribimus et scriptos absumimus igne libellos: | Exitus est studii parva favilla mei.

⁴¹ The line between legitimate literary artifice and forgery is often hard to draw; cf. Chatterton's famous reply to Horace Walpole: "Thou mayst call me Cheat. | Say, didst thou ne'er indulge in such Deceit? | Who wrote Otranto?"

⁴² Paul, the great disciple who in a certain sense exploited Jesus, never knew him "after the flesh," nor did he greatly care to learn the actual facts of his life. Ovid's case is somewhat similar. Although he enjoyed the intimate companionship of Propertius, Ponticus and Bassus, there is no evidence to show that he ever knew the modest and retiring Tibullus during his lifetime; cf. *Trist.* IV 10, 51 Vergilium vidi tantum; nec amara Tibullo | Tempus amicitiae fata dedere meae, "Unkind fate refused the time which might have made us friends." Cf. also Martinon, *Tibulle* XLVIII: "Il faut considérer qu' Ovide n'a guère connu Tibulle que par ses oeuvres"; similar is the view of Postgate, *Selections*, XVII.

explanatory introduction is provided. Many of the *Priapea* also are monologues spoken by Priapus. (4) It is universally recognized that the feigned *Epistles of the Heroines* have been developed from the exercises of the rhetorical schools; for we know that in the schools rhetorical speeches were constantly placed in the mouth of mythological and historical personages.⁴³ Hence the *Heroides* have sometimes been described as "erotic *suasoriae*, based on the declamations of the schools" (Cruttwell, *Rom. Lit.* 306). Similarly the short imitation of Tibullus (IV 13) and the two short impersonations of Vergil (*Catal.* VII and XIV) may well be viewed as versified speeches and rhetorical exercises such as, in a prose form, were certainly common in the schools; for strict accuracy they need only the caption '*Tibullus (Vergilius) loquitur.*' Sommer (*Catal.*, p. 68) has rightly conjectured that *Catal.* XIV was composed by an admirer of Vergil, who, "in the scholastic manner (*scholastico more*), assumed to speak in his name," and Ribbeck (*Röm. Dicht.* II 240) thinks it possible that Ovid first treated some of the themes of the *Heroides* as prescribed exercises while he was still a pupil of the schools.⁴⁴ When we believe that the Sulpicia Letters and the Vergilian 'Trifles' are genuine, we pay a great tribute to the dramatic and artistic ability of the true author; we have in the *Latin Anthology* also fifteen epitaphs of Vergil written in the first person (II 51 ff., 59 ff. Riese), but few, I suppose, will defend their authenticity.

III. *Previous Studies of the Sulpicia Elegies.*

In Gruppe's day many scholars were disposed to reject as spurious all the Sulpicia poems of the fourth book without exception,⁴⁵ but after Gruppe came forward with his ingenious com-

⁴³ Ribbeck, *Röm. Dicht.* II 239; Schanz, *Röm. Lit.* § 297; Zingerle, *Ovid u. s. Vorgänger* I 119; K. F. Smith, *Martial and Other Essays*, 59, 72.

⁴⁴ Partly because of this close relation to the rhetorical schools, Riese regarded the *Heroides* as the first work of Ovid, and in his edition (Leipzig 1871) gave them their old position before the *Amores*; see his preface, p. ix. Some of them were no doubt spondaic in their earliest publication, but as a rule they have been carefully revised; they still retain, however, a few polysyllabic endings (L. Müller, *R. M.*² 29, 259),—a clear indication of their early composition.

⁴⁵ Heyne, in his three editions (1755, 1777, 1798), had found these

promise, retaining the 'elegies' for Tibullus and giving up, in a chivalrous and romantic way, the 'little letters' to Sulpicia herself, the defenders of the 'elegies' gained fresh courage and naturally sought to bring forward as many surface resemblances as they could find between these poems and the genuine works of Tibullus.⁴⁶ Acute critics, however, have not failed to note also many points of difference and of sharp divergence. Thus Ribbeck (*Röm. Dicht.* II 196), after observing that these poems "breathe the atmosphere of the city and show a sense of the elegance of the high society of Rome," adds that they are wholly "foreign to the Tibullan manner." Marx (Pauly-Wissowa, s. v. *Albius*, col. 1322) speaks briefly of "the unknown author of these elegies, who in some turns reminds us of Tibullus." Postgate (*Selections*, XXXIX) aptly remarks: "The treatment of his themes (which the poet of these elegies presents) is somewhat freer and lighter than Tibullus'; it is more impersonal, and, I had almost said, more professional. . . . We observe but very little which we might call distinctive of Tibullus." Baehrens (*Tib. Blätter* 46) attributes "these most charming pearls of Roman poetry" to a poet of the first rank and adds: "The representation is too quiet, too objective and too strictly limited to the subject in hand to be attributed to Tibullus, who is constantly subjective, constantly rambling and tossed hither and thither by conflicting feelings. . . . In the circle of Messalla there moved not merely such dilettanti as Lygdamus, the author of the *Culex*, (*Ciris*) &c., but also true poets like Ovid and others."⁴⁷ Sellar (*Elegiac Poets* 256)

elegies very charming, but wholly different in character from those of Tibullus, and had therefore unhesitatingly rejected Tibullan authorship; see Cartault, *Corpus Tibull.* 60, 69, and cf. Zingerle, *Abh.* I 22.

⁴⁶ See Knappe, *op. cit.*; Zingerle, *Kl. philol. Abh.* II (Innsbruck 1877), 45-90. The latter offers many statistics and minute observations, which are usually more curious than valuable.

⁴⁷ Cf. K. F. Smith, *Tib.* 79, on the authorship of the Sulpicia cycle: "Messalla's circle was, to say the least, exceptionally favoured, if it possessed a second elegiac poet so like Tib. in his poetical temperament and so nearly his equal in genius." With a strange forgetfulness of the facts of literary history, Crusius says (Pauly-Wissowa V 2297, s. v. "*Elegie*"): "It is not very probable that a second poet of such high and original powers has lived in the entourage of Messalla. If the verses belong to Tibullus, we should have to recognize in them a later phase of his development."

observes respecting the Sulpicia cycle: "The art is not like that of Tibullus; . . . it is the art of a poet dealing objectively and somewhat playfully with a love with which he sympathises as a spectator." References to other scholars also, such as Martinon, Fabricius, &c., who have rejected the ascription to Tibullus, may be found in Cartault, *Corpus Tibull.* 564.

An especially valuable contribution to the study of these elegies has been made by Bürger (*Hermes* XL [1905], 329 ff.), who has discussed the relation in which they stand to Propertius. In his view the elegy IV 2 shows clear imitation of the fourth book of Propertius in the three following passages: v. 14 *Vertumnus* . . . mille habet ornatus, mille *decenter* habet; cf. Prop. IV 2, 45 (*Vertumnus* speaks) *nec flos ullus hiat pratis, quin ille decenter* | *impositus fronti langueat ante meae*:⁴⁸ v. 20 *proximus Eois colligit Indus aquis*; cf. Prop. IV 3, 10 *ustus et Eoa discolor Indus aqua*:⁴⁹ v. 22 *et testudinea Phoebe superba lyra*; cf. Prop. IV 6, 32 *non ille (Phoebus) attulerat* . . . | *et testudineae carmen inerme lyrae*.⁵⁰ Hence Bürger concludes that the composition of the Sulpicia elegies falls after Prop. IV and consequently after 15 B. C.; he says expressly (p. 332): "These poems are not by Tibullus and have first arisen after his death."⁵¹

⁴⁸ Ovid greatly admired this charming elegy upon Vertumnus, and has imitated it twice in the *Copa* (vss. 18, 22) as well as in Met. XIV 643 ff.

⁴⁹ Twice elsewhere Ov. imitates this same Propertian verse without the *Eoa*, but with *discolor* or the like, namely A. A. 3, 130 *quos legit in viridi decolor Indus aqua*; T. 5, 3, 24 *et quascumque bibit discolor Indus aquas*. (We do not need to assume with Zingerle (*Abh.* II 84) that Prop. first imitated the Tibullan verse, and Ov. afterwards imitated the Propertian.)

⁵⁰ *Testudinea lyra* occurs only in these two passages.—As Bürger fully notes, Olsen had already very carefully and methodically pointed out this relation to the fourth book of Propertius in his *Propertius und Tibullus, Comment. Gryphiswald.*, Berlin 1887, pp. 27-32, and correctly maintained that, wherever relations exist between Propertius and Tib. IV, Propertius is the original. Belling, *op. cit.* 304 and 372, accepts the proofs of Olsen as wholly convincing, and assumes that both Prop. IV 2 and 4 became known in some way to Tibullus before their publication in book form.—Bürger is of course mistaken (p. 329) in holding that Tib. IV 2 shows 'imitation' of II 2 and was written after it; the true relation is just the opposite.

⁵¹ In spite, however, of Bürger's protest (p. 328), Belling is right in

It is noteworthy also that several scholars have shown remarkable acuteness with respect to single poems of the cycle. Thus R. Richter (*De quarti libri Tib. elegiis*, Dresden 1875), though accepting the other elegies, rejects the Tibullan authorship of IV 5, on the ground of the many evident imitations of the genuine Tibullus which this piece betrays, and Hailer (*Blätter für das Gymnasial-schulwesen* XXX [1894], pp. 265-267), noticing in a very brief manner the occurrence of certain bold constructions both in the *Panegyric* and in IV 6, correctly assumed their common authorship and their dependence upon Propertius. The close relation which still another elegy, IV 3, bears to the Adonis myth, has been pointed out by Wilhelm, *Rhein. Mus.* LXI [1906], 95 ff.; cf. also Maass, *Hermes* XXIV [1889], 520 ff. Although Wilhelm does not recognize the fact, this Alexandrine trait is an evidence of spuriousness.

It is not unlikely that the Sulpicia elegies also show one or two imitations of Vergil's *Aeneid* (19 B. C.) and perhaps one of Horace's *Carmen Saeculare* (17 B. C.); see below, Part II. Postgate (*Class. Review* IX [1895], 77) unhesitatingly rejects the Tibullan authorship of the whole Sulpicia cycle; he has also justly noted (*Selections* 196) several very striking borrowings from Propertius in IV 13 (vss. 3, 4, 8). One of these likewise relates to the fourth book: v. 4 *nec formosa est oculis ulla puella meis*; cf. Prop. IV 4, 32 *et formosa oculis arma Sabina meis*.⁵² Ovid's imitation, I may add, wholly disposes of the reading *famosa* which has been adopted here by a few editors (Phillimore, Rothstein).—Belling (*op. cit.* 29, n. 2) also points out briefly, but admirably, some of the close parallels between Lyg. 1 and IV 2; cf. also Schanz, *Röm. Litt.* § 284, p. 239.

IV. *The True Relation of Ovid to Tibullus.*

Since we are about to separate accurately for the first time the works of Tibullus and of Ovid, we may estimate briefly the relation in which the two poets stand to each other. Tibullus

the parallels to Tib. IV which he quotes (*op. cit.* 374, n. 1) from Ovid himself. For A. A. 3, 386 certainly echoes Tib. IV 4, 8, not Tib. 1, 4, 66, and Am. 2, 13, 15 goes back much more nearly to Tib. IV 4, 19. 20 than to Prop. 2, 28 b, 41. 42.

⁵² Belling (*op. cit.* 373) takes the same view as Postgate, and compares also Tib. IV 14, 1 (*rumor ait*) with Prop. IV 4, 47 (*ut rumor ait*).

was scarcely a professional man of letters at all⁵³ and he had little sense (for that age) of the continuity of literature.⁵⁴ He did not possess the gift of rapid facility, and as Sellar (*Elegiac Poets* 236) has well observed, could be "roused to write only when under the influence of some strong attachment." He therefore composed but little, and has left only the ten elegies of the first book and the three genuine elegies of the second,—thirteen poems in all.⁵⁵ He cared nothing for literary fame and had certainly made no provision for his own unpublished poems. It was therefore indeed a fortunate circumstance that a thoroughly vigorous and masterful poet arose in the same circle, who collected and preserved the three unpublished elegies, generously added to them his own brilliant, though at times immature, productions, and published the whole resulting collection in permanent form. For, wholly unlike Tibullus, Ovid from earliest infancy had dreamed of literary immortality, and no poet has ever lived who had a livelier sense of the unbroken continuity of the literary tradition, or who understood better the meaning of 'pure Castalia' and of 'lovely Helicon.'⁵⁶ Ovid

⁵³ Cf. Jacoby, *Rhein. Mus.* LXV [1910], 72: "Er war doch schliesslich nur . . . ein Dilettant höherer Ordnung . . . Tibull ist kein Literat geworden, wie Catull, Propertius, Ovid; sowenig wie er je ein Stadtmensch geworden ist, ein Grossstädter vom Typ dieser drei Dichter . . . Tibull ist mehr zufällig zu dichterischer Produktion gekommen."

⁵⁴ Thus when it is said (Zingerle, *Ovid u. s. Vorgänger*, I 132) that Tib. represents the genuinely Roman or nationalistic development in Roman elegy as opposed to the Grecizing tendency of Catullus, Propertius and Ovid, all that is meant—all that can be meant—is that he was solitary and unworldly, in a word, that he stood apart from the literary movement and the learned Alexandrinism of his day. He certainly cannot be the representative of a nationalistic group or school, as Hendrickson (*Class. Phil.* XII [1917], 350) and perhaps Gruppe (*op. cit.* 265) appear to think, for no such group ever existed at Rome, so far as relates at least to the treatment of the elegy or the ode. Surely Nageotte (*Litt. lat.* 376) is more nearly correct, when he speaks of Tib. as being "sans parti pris d'école et d'érudition," "without definite choice of school or learning."

⁵⁵ Tibullus, however, died very young. Harrington (*Proceedings Am. Phil. Ass.* 1901, p. 137) and Cartault (*Tibulle* 5) may possibly be right in placing his birth in 48 B. C. instead of the usually assumed 54 B. C. Gruppe thinks that he was born between 54 and 49, Postgate between 55 and 50.

⁵⁶ "Ovid," says de la Ville de Mirmont (*Jeunesse d'Ovide* 4), "is, in

again has abundant variety and a rich fancy, while Tibullus is limited to his own personal experience as the lover of simple country life, the singer of Delia and of Nemesis, the loyal friend of Messalla. He attempts no lofty flights, and his verse, though sincere and sweet, is not without a certain monotony and narrowness of range.⁵⁷

Tibullus, it is true, was much admired by his own contemporaries, and the elegies which he addressed to Delia, though few in number, rank among the most perfect productions of ancient poetry. Yet we may well doubt whether his slender volume would ever have survived the ravages of time and have come down to our modern era, if Ovid had not added bulk to the collection and incorporated in it many of his own choicest works. Certain it is that the Tibullus of later literary tradition is not strictly the historical poet of the thirteen genuine elegies, but rather the double-star, Tibullus-Ovidius, that shines partly with borrowed light. Plessis (*Poésie Lat.* 376) has finely said that "Tibullus owes a part of his reputation for tenderness and sincerity to the verses of Lygdamus which long centuries have attributed to him." There can be no doubt also that a large part of Tibullus' fame is due to the charming and graceful elegies of the Sulpicia cycle,—elegies, I may add, which Ovid, in all his later work, never surpassed and seldom equalled.⁵⁸ The great Messalinus hymn (II 5) has even given to the pacifist poet of the age of Augustus a touch of genuine nationalism, a suggestion even of militarism and flamboyant jingoism. Not only then has Ovid in the Lygdamus elegies added to the volume of the simple-minded and unworldly Latin Rousseau a good share of this world's pomp and splendor, but the Sulpicia poems

point of time, the first of the 'men of letters.'" Cf. also Nageotte, *Litt. lat.* 380: "Mais qualités et défauts, tout est bien d'un homme qui a mordu le laurier," and Schanz § 291, p. 265: "Seine Augen waren auf den dichterischen Lorbeer gerichtet." Hence Ovid often expresses Shakspeare's thought, "much is the force of heaven-bred poesy"; cf. *A. A.* 3, 549 f.; *P.* 3, 4, 93.

⁵⁷ Cf. the elder Scaliger's terse characterization (*Poet.* VI 7): *unifomis ille paene totus est . . . Audis enim casas, focos, rura, nemora, praela, spicas, sacra tum saepe tum multum.*

⁵⁸ In praise of these elegies, see Gruppe, *op. cit.* 27, 267, and the judgments assembled by Zingerle, *Abh.* II 90.

also, as we have seen, introduce us in a romantic way to the distinguished and high-bred society of Rome.⁵⁹ It is true that Quintilian (10, 1, 93) pronounces Tibullus "the most finished and elegant author of Roman elegy,"⁶⁰ but the only actual reminiscence of 'Tibullus' in his works is drawn from one of the gay and sparkling pieces of Ovid.⁶¹ It is perfectly evident then that Quintilian bestows the palm of excellence not upon the poet of the thirteen elegies (one and a half books), but upon the much more brilliant and varied Tibullus-Ovidius, whose works, in the modern codex form, comprise four books.⁶² Similarly it is incontestable that the lines of the collection which have passed most fully into English quotation and poetry are not the lines of Tibullus at all, but those of Ovid.⁶³ It is difficult to tear apart what the long centuries have closely joined. Severe critics,—to whom alone this study is addressed—will be able to separate Tibullus and Ovid, but the great body of general readers and casual students will doubtless always unite the two Augustan brother-poets, much as they will always associate and fuse together Socrates and Plato, Paul and Jesus, Giorgione and Titian, Raphael and Raphael's disciples.

⁵⁹ For love of splendor and luxury here, see esp. IV 2, 15-20; II 3, 45-52. Note also that the admirable description of Sulpicia's rich dress and of her personal charms (IV 2, 3-12) is not at all in the manner of Tibullus, who follows rather Homer's usage with respect to Helen of Troy, and never actually pictures the beauty of Delia in words, but gives only the effects produced by her beauty; cf. Smith, p. 48: "Unlike Prop., he does not revel in her beauty, he does not enumerate her single charms."

⁶⁰ (Elegiae) . . . tersus atque elegans maxime auctor.

⁶¹ IV 2, 8 illam . . . componit *furtim subsequiturque decor*; cf. Quint. 1, 11, 19 unde nos non id agentes *furtim decor* ille discentibus traditus *prosequatur*.

⁶² Ullrich, *Stud. Tib.* 68, n. 2, states just the opposite of the actual facts here. Nor am I wholly sure that when Seneca (*N. Q.* 4, 2, 2) quotes the verse Tib. 1, 7, 26 and attributes it to Ovid, the wrong ascription is entirely due to accident. Seneca may still have known that a large part of the collection was the work of Ovid, though he makes the mistake of attributing to him a verse which is found in the first book.

⁶³ Thus Shakspeare's "At lovers' perjuries, | They say, Jove laughs" = Lyg. 6, 49; often quoted is 'traitress, but though traitress, still beloved' (Lyg. 6, 56 'perfida sed, quamvis perfida, cara tamen'), cf. K. F. Smith, *A. J. P.* XXXVII 151; the famous verses IV 13, 9-12 have already been mentioned above (p. 12, n. 30).

Taking it by and large Ovid was scarcely more the disciple of Tibullus than he was of Catullus, Calvus, Cinna, Valgius Rufus, Vergil, Lucretius, Propertius, Eratosthenes, Callimachus and a score of other Roman and Alexandrian poets, each one of whom he sincerely worshipped.⁶⁴ For in truth, with the sensuous temperament of a Correggio, but the imitative genius of a Raphael, he holds out his hands in eager, generous admiration towards all that was great and fine in the poetic art both of Rome and of Alexandria.⁶⁵ Yet it is evident both from the epicedion (*Am.* 3, 9) and from other poems that he regarded himself as a follower in some special sense of the 'refined Tibullus,' and recognized in him the supreme artist who first brought Roman elegy to perfection.⁶⁶ For just as Raphael, the assimilator of so many styles, the 'sedulous ape' of so many great painters, derived the lovely type of the Umbrian Madonna from Perugino, the teacher of his youth, so it is undoubtedly true that Ovid took from Tibullus as his master certain precious refinements of his art, which in their origin are partly Roman

⁶⁴ *T.* 4, 10, 41 temporis illius colui fovique poetas, | quotque aderant vates, rebar adesse deos; 5, 3, 55. See S. G. Owen's eloquent tribute, *Ency. Brit.*, 11th ed., s. v. "*Ovid*," XX p. 388: "He heartily admires everything in literature, Greek or Roman, that had any merit. . . . It is by him, not by Vergil or Horace, that Lucretius is first named and his sublimity is first acknowledged. The image of Catullus that most haunts the imagination is that of the poet who died so early, 'hedera juvenalia cinctus Tempora,' &c." Mackail also (*Lat. Lit.* 136) speaks of "his genuine love of literature and admiration for genius, unmingled in his case with the slightest traces of literary jealousy."

⁶⁵ Zingerle (*Ovid* I 133) describes him as "a poetic eclectic to a certain extent," and speaks both of his original qualities and of his "correct feeling (*Takt*) in his imitations" (I 135). He sums up (II 113): "Ovid has thoroughly well understood how to appropriate from all his predecessors and to make his own that which suited the character of his own poetry"; cf. Ganzenmüller, *Philologus* LXX 276. Nageotte, who devoted much study to Ovid and is one of the best critics of his works, gives a favorable but just estimate at this point (*Litt. lat.* 380): "Même en imitant il est déjà lui-même, il a sa marque. . . . Il a beau emprunter de Properce des tournures, des formes de style, des sujets d'épigramme; il a beau savoir Tibulle presque par cœur, sa Muse est comme Iris qui dans sa course aérienne se nuance des mille reflets de la lumière sans cesser d'être belle et déesse."

⁶⁶ Tibullus is the perfecter of Roman elegy (Zingerle, *Ovid* I 54); Tibullus and Ovid are the principal stages of the elegy (Gruppe I 387).

and partly Greek, namely, the requirement of the dactyl in the first foot, the dissyllabic close, the unity of the distich, the avoidance of elision, the light and rapid movement of the dactylic virtuosity. This obligation he has more than repaid and has done all for Tibullus that the most devoted and most self-abnegating follower could do. Thus he tells us that, like the Penelope of Homer, the Nemesis of Tibullus shall possess undying fame (*Am.* 3, 9, 31), but with rare self-effacement he does not tell us that he has himself composed a full half of the Nemesis book. If we consider then only the beautiful and touching epicedion (*Am.* 3, 9) and the gift of the two wonderfully brilliant elegies, II 5 and IV 13,—neither of them wholly free from minor faults, it is true, yet both of them, in many features of power and interest, far surpassing much of the work of Tibullus himself—we must freely admit that they constitute one of the noblest and most generous tributes that a grateful poet has ever paid to the memory of an admired and honored predecessor. In the happy Elysian valley, where, with pure draughts of Lethean water, the 'etherial sense' is cleansed from every earthly stain and where the brother-poets, Calvus and Catullus, Cinna and Valgius, sweet 'singers of Euphorion,' ivy-wreathed and laurel-crowned immortals, wander hand in hand together,⁶⁷ there surely Tibullus also, the perfecter of the elegy, and Ovid, the disciple who was greater than his master, will meet in congenial fellowship, and, amid the strains of Orphean music and 'words that are few but tuneful sweet,'⁶⁸ will calm and assuage the poet's unsatisfied and infinite longing, which even the fairest symbols of earth can but feebly and dimly express,—iure suas requiescere Musas | Et leviter blandum poterunt deponere amorem.⁶⁹

R. S. RADFORD.

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE.

⁶⁷ Cf. *Am.* 3, 9, 62.

⁶⁸ Cf. Dante, *Inferno*, IV 114 (Of the dwellers in the 'Castle of Fame') 'parlavan rado con voci soavi.'

⁶⁹ Cp. *Ciris* 11.

II.—VOLUNTAS FATI IN LATIN SYNTAX.

‘Haman prepared a gallows for Mordecai, only to be hanged on it himself.’

For such an infinitive of destiny, and the *περιπέτεια* which it often implies, one might send the Latin Prose pupil to such passages as Val. Max. vi. 9. 7: T. Aufidius, cum Asiatici publici exiguam admodum particulam habuisset, postea totam Asiam proconsulari imperio obtinuit; or Cic. *Tusc.* v. 107: innumera-biles alii, qui semel egressi numquam domum reuerterunt; or, in favourable circumstances, to Ennius apud Cic. *Tusc.* iii. 44: Ex opibus summis opis egens, Hector, tuae; or, finally, to Florus ii. 18. 8: Perditis enim rebus profugit Asiamque uelis petit uenturus ibi in manus hostium et catenas et . . . sub percussore moriturus. But it is no part of the tradition of Latin Prose teaching to write of Haman thus: Parauit Aman Mardo-chaeo patibulum, in quo ipse suspenderetur, where *in quo* is supposed to introduce a final clause, indicating the purpose of destiny. My contention is that that is as sound Latin as any of the others; and it is on this theme, in its various aspects, that I wish to enlarge.

To prevent needless complications, let me first set forth the following as the most striking evidence:

- (1) Val. Max. vi. 9. 1 Manlius Torquatus . . . in hoc, credo, fortunae nubilo adulescentiae contemptu perfusus, quo senectutis eius decus lucidius enitesceret.
- (2) Curtius x. 5. 23 Subibat inter haec animum . . . ipsum Dareum floruisse paulisper, ut crudelius posset exstingui.
- (3) Lucan *Phars.* vii. 596—

Viuat et, ut Bruti procumbat uictima, regnet.

- (4) Tac. *Hist.* i. 48 [Piso] ipse diu exul, quadriduo Caesar, properata adoptione ad hoc tantum maiori fratri praelatus est ut prior occideretur.
- (5) Tac. *Ann.* xi. 25 Isque illi finis inscitiae erga domum suam fuit: haud multo post flagitia uxoris noscere ac punire adactus est [est *suppleuit Nipperdey: om. M.*] ut deinde ardesceret in nuptias incestas.

- (6) Juv. x. 104 ff. nam qui nimios optabat honores
 Et nimias poscebat opes, numerosa parabat
 Excelsae turris tabulata, unde altior esset
 Casus et impulsae praeceps inmane ruinae.
- (7) Juv. x. 166 f. I demens et saeuas curre per Alpes,
 Vt pueris placeas et declamatio fias.

On these I would remark:

(i) Passages (1) (2) and (4) seem certain instances; *ad hoc* in (4) can only prepare the way for a final clause (cp. Hor. Sat. ii. 8. 25 f.—

Nomentanus ad hoc, qui si quid forte lateret
 Indice monstraret digito),

and *in hoc* is still more convincing.

(ii) The use of the subjunctive with *unde* in (6) might be prospective merely; it virtually fulfils all the conditions of the prospective subjunctive in relative clauses as discussed by Mr. Goodrich in the *Classical Review* 1917 pp. 83 ff. On the other hand H. L. Wilson's note, 'Perverse purpose; the disastrous result is so sure to follow, that it is stated as if it were the purpose,' appears to me inadequate.

(iii) In passages (3) and (7), possibly also in (6), the subordinate clauses might express 'ironical' purpose on the part of the main actor. I think that in the typical 'final clause of destiny' the reader is momentarily puzzled by the choice between such 'ironical' purpose and the purpose of destiny. There is no serious conflict between the two: any sinister or over-ruling influence of fate can hardly be hinted at without a dash of irony.

(iv) Passage (5) is *prima facie* the most questionable. Were there no other fairly clear instances of our construction, we should be tempted to regard the *ut ardesceret* as merely consecutive, and that in one of two senses: (a) 'with the result that he was inflamed.' The result is remote or at all events indirect: and though the same remark perhaps does not apply to every Latin author, Tacitus' consecutive clauses usually denote a perfectly direct consequence. Or (b) = *ita ut*, either 'though he was compelled . . . he still was inflamed,' or 'his

punishing of Messalina was accompanied by the circumstance that he was inflamed.¹ Now Cicero can write: *Potest igitur L. Cornelius condemnari, ut non C. Mari factum condemnetur?* (*Balb.* § 46), and Horace can write: *Continui montes . . . sed ut ueniens dextrum latus aspiciat sol* (*Epist.* i. 16. 5f. cp. *A. P.* 256 ff.). But Tacitus seems invariably to use *ita ut* or *ita tamen ut* when he means one of these.² Further, I regard it as almost inconceivable that Tacitus, at one of the crises of his narrative, should decant for us the vapid champagne of an *ut* clause that is in any sense merely consecutive.³ Much the same remark applies to the two passages from Juvenal.

(v) All in all, it seems to me that the seven passages hang together, and will any one explanation cover every one of them but Gerber and Greef's account of passage (5) (*Lex. Tac.* 1725 a) '*Indicatur uoluntas fati*'?

Perhaps a further analysis may repay us. It strikes the reader at once that, in the sentences quoted, so little attempt is made to tone down the expression, or in some way prepare the mind for the final clause in what appears a very unusual sense. Valerius Maximus has *credo, fortunae nubilo, in hoc*; one of the others has *ad hoc*; apart from these everything is startlingly bald and brusque. What would Cicero have written? A clue may possibly be found in *Verr.* ii. 8: . . . *qui (annus) sic eos adflixerat ut salui esse non possent, nisi C. Marcellus quasi aliquo fato uenisset, ut bis ex eadem familia salus Siciliae constitueretur . . .* (where I take *ut . . . constitueretur* as a final clause). How could so much be dropped, and the idea yet remain intelligible? Are there other types of sentence in Latin that throw light on the development, or support our steadfast or wavering belief that we are really dealing with final, and not consecutive, clauses?

¹Cp. Dahl, *Die lateinische Partikel VT* (Kristiania 1882), p. 202, 'Ita weist auf die begleitenden Umstände hin, welche im Vt-satz beschrieben werden.'

²I neglect for the moment the 'stipulative' sense 'unter der Bedingung dass': Gerber and Greef have two instances of plain *ut* with this meaning on p. 1721 b. I appeal to Dahl p. 215: but of course a thorough-going supporter of Professor Bennett might take serious exception to my argument.

³See also Additional Note A.

To begin with, I would call attention to the fact—even if the observation may appear trite—that in Latin, more readily than in English, though the final clause represents the purpose of the ‘action’ of the main verb, we may not be told, we may not be expected even to infer, what mind it is that entertains the purpose. Of course English goes some distance hand in hand with Latin: in neither language is there any difficulty with passive verbs, e. g. *Juv. x. 41 f.*—

et sibi consul

Ne placeat, curru seruus portatur eodem,

or where the subject of the main verb is not supposed to be really a free agent. But in English, where the main verb is active, and the subject to it acting spontaneously, it would be strange if the purpose described in the final clause were not a purpose entertained by that subject. We rebel against the statement in English ‘Haman prepared a gallows for Mordecai *in order that* he might be hanged on it himself.’ In Latin (at any rate, in Latin of a certain flavour) this is not so definitely true; and one must often be on one’s guard against a false inference.

Secondly, the diligent reader of Roby’s and Riemann’s works will remember these great grammarians’ explanation of the use of *nedum*: ‘the prevention of the occurrence of the greater event is rhetorically regarded as the purpose of the occurrence of the less event.’⁴ And the type of final clause which we are considering belongs also to the general head ‘rhetorical-final clause’: it is not inappropriate to regard Haman’s own execution as ‘rhetorically’ the purpose of the erection of the gallows.

Thirdly, one rhetorical and kindred use of the final subjunctive became fairly common in Latin. Under the influence of the desire for piquancy, clauses of slightly varying type, but in the main expressing a ‘consecutive’ idea, have from the Augustan age onwards a tendency to appear as final clauses. Take a sentence from Caesar (*B. G. v. 48. 10*): *Tum fumi incendiorum procul uidebantur, quae res omnem dubitationem aduentus legionum expulit.* In Livy and Curtius this might readily have

⁴Roby, *Grammar* § 1658, cp. Riemann, *Syntaxe Latine* p. 507 Rem. I. The explanation has not won universal acceptance.

been written: *Tum ne quid de adventu legionum dubitaretur, fumi incendiorum procul uidebantur*. Tacitus wishes to say 'The Cotini, to their shame, have iron mines' (which might have furnished them with swords); he writes (*Germ.* 43): *Cotini, quo magis pudeat, et ferrum effodiunt*. Pre-Augustan Latin would probably have been: *quae res magis eos dedecet*. Curtius (*viii.* 3. 3) wishes to say that the presence of Alexander (as supporter) made certain entreaties more effective, but he gives the sentence a rhetorical twist: *et quo efficaciores essent preces, haud procul erat Alexander*. Consecutive *ut* would do better justice to the logic of the situation.—Sometimes this idea of purpose which the historian professes to discover between event and event is inextricably united with the idea of 'prevention,' for which the Romans, after all deductions are made, had a very keen flair. Take e. g. *Livy viii.* 10. 10, *Corpus ne eo die inueniretur nox quaerentes oppressit*, where *oppressit* might be taken as having the pregnant sense 'overtook and prevented.' One cannot be certain that the explanation 'rhetorical purpose' should be preferred to the other.—But when we have reached developments like these, it requires but a step to pass from them to our sentences (1) to (7), where what might have been described as a result, possibly a remote and indirect result, is rhetorically but effectively regarded as a purpose, and the grave or ironical tone and context inevitably suggest that it is the purpose of destiny.

Let me illustrate more fully this use of the 'rhetorical final'—if it may be so termed—in place of the 'logical consecutive.' I suggest that in the following instances we have not yet reached the 'final clause of destiny.'

(a) *Hirtius Bell. Gall.* *viii.* 48. 2 *Volusenus ad eam uirtutem . . . magnum odium Commi adiungebat quo libentius id faceret* [as though one would emphasize the idea 'prompting him'].

(β) *Virg. Aen.* *iv.* 452 ff.

*Quo magis inceptum peragat lucemque relinquat,
Vidit, turieremis cum dona imponeret aris
(Horrendum dictu) latices nigrescere sacros*
[in prosy English 'as a warning to . . .'].

- (γ) Livy v. 33. 11 quos loca ipsa efferarunt, ne quid ex antiquo praeter sonum linguae, nec eum incorruptum, retinerent ['preventing them'].
- (δ) Ovid *Her.* vi. 5 f.
Nam ne pacta tibi praeter mea regna redires,
Cum cuperes, uentos non habuisse potes.
- (ε) Ovid *Met.* i. 151 f.
Neue foret terris securior arduus aether
Adfectasse ferunt regnum caeleste Gigantas.
- (ζ) Ovid *Met.* xi. 30 f. Neu desint tela furori,
Forte boues presso subigebant uomere terram.
- (η) Curtius v. 1. 39 Ceterum quo minus damnum sentiret,
(exercitus) identidem incremento renouabatur.
- (θ) Curtius vii. 4. 17 Alienum habes regnum, quo facilius eo careas.
- (ι) Pliny *N. H.* xxxiii. 157 usu attritis caelaturis, ne figura discerni possit [*Mayhoff reads sic, ne*].
- (κ) August. *Ciu. Dei* iii. 14 donec Horatiorum soror adderetur, ne minus haberet mortium etiam Roma quae uicerat.

But at this point the issue ought to be definitely raised: Are the *ne* clauses just quoted final? For there are certain passages in Livy and Tacitus on which a very usual comment is the misleading and ambiguous '*Ne = ut non.*' Roth on Tac. *Agr.* 6 is a reference frequently given to allay one's doubts of the truth of this dictum. But doubts are hardly allayed when one finds that Roth's list (of about nine instances) includes Pliny *Epist.* i. 20. 8: Idem ait se . . . pro C. Cornelio quadri-duo egisse, ne dubitare possimus quae latius dixerit . . . coartasse—which can very easily be brought under Roby's rubric (§ 1660) 'purpose, not of the principal action itself, but of the mention of the action'; it includes also Cic. *Orat.* 101 Ne fuerit, and Cic. *Acad.* ii. 102 Ne sit, both of which are surely concessive sentences, rhetorical commands (Roby § 1620 onwards). Another adversary is Haase, who in his note 493 to Reisig's *Vorlesungen* refers to the passages 'even in Cicero and still more in later writers' 'wo *ne* ganz ohne die Bedeutung der

Absicht für *ut non* gesetzt ist'; and Schmalz writes similarly in his Syntax § 336: 'Erst mit dem Verfall der Sprache tritt *ne* statt *ut non* in reinen Konsekutivsätzen ein, wie dies für Tac. und Spätere . . . festgestellt ist, vgl. Tac. Ann. ii. 29 ita moderans, ne lenire neue asperare crimina uideretur.'

However it may be with subsequent writers, this is harsh criticism of Tacitus, as though that master of innuendo and nuance chose blindfold between *ne* and *ut non*: for *ut non*, *ut nemo*, *ut nihil* occur frequently enough in his writings (see Gerber and Greef 1718-1719). Generally speaking, I think that we ought to return to the principle which Madvig, on *De Fin.* ii. 5. 15, states [for *ut ne* and probably *a fortiori* for *ne*⁵]: 'accedit levis significatio studii et uoluntatis.' Wherever the ideas of effort, stipulation, control, prevention, could with some rhetorical effect be brought out, the Roman writer did not hesitate to bring them out by the use of *ne*. And, in reference to the type of clauses which we are specially discussing, if we surrender *ne* at the first brush as equivalent merely to *ut non* and purely consecutive, are we prepared to throw over the *ut* and *quo* clauses already considered, on the ground that they also are, *si dis placet*, even in face-value consecutive? 'Verfall der Sprache'! It would topple about our ears!—Of course, these objections do not hold against a statement of this sort: '*Ut non* would be adequate to the historical and logical narration of the facts: the writer rhetorically but consciously works in a nuance of meaning by the use of *ne*.'

To recur to the *uoluntas fati*, the following passages will show how Latin writers down to the time of Augustine employed the final subjunctive in this sense. Often the idea is incidental merely, but even then Cicero's *quasi aliquo fato* would not be out of place, and they are more than the 'rhetorical final.' In Augustine's scheme *uoluntas fati* becomes *uoluntas Dei*, occasionally perhaps *uoluntas diaboli*. I regard the series as following up the passages (1) to (7).

⁵ It would be misleading not to remind the reader of Professor J. S. Reid's note on *Pro Sulla* § 27, where he decides for consecutive uses of *ut ne*. But I have the impression that Dr. Reid would not extend this license to plain *ne*. Schmalz (*Syntax* § 336), though allowing a consecutive *ne*, refuses to accept a consecutive *ut ne*!

- (8) Virg. *Aen.* iv. 680 f.
His etiam struxi manibus, patriosque uocaui
Voce deos, sic te ut posita crudelis abessem?
- (9) Livy vii. 1. 7 et ab seditione et a bello quietis rebus, ne
quando a metu ac periculis uacarent, pestilentia ingens orta.
- (10) Livy vii. 27. 1 cum et foris pax et domi concordia ordi-
num otium esset, ne nimis laetae res essent, pestilentia
ciuitatem adorta coegit senatum . . .
- (11) Livy xxiv. 29. 3 Ceterum leuauerunt modo in praesentia
uelut corpus aegrum, quo mox in grauiorem morbum
recideret.
- (12) Livy xlv. 44. 1 Consulem . . . ne sincero gaudio fru-
eretur, cura de minore filio stimulabat.
- (13) Ovid *Her.* iv. 61 f.
En ego nunc, ne forte parum Minoia credar,
In socias leges ultima gentis eo.
- (14) Ovid *Her.* viii. 81 f. Ne non Pelopeia credar,
Ecce Neoptolemo praeda parata fui.
- (15) Ovid *Her.* xvii. 33 f.
Thesea paenituit, Paris ut succederet illi,
Ne quando nomen non sit in ore meum.
- (16) Ovid *Met.* ix. 735 f. Ne non tamen omnia Crete
Monstra ferat, taurum dilexit filia Solis.
- (17) Ovid *Met.* xiii. 496 f.
Et, ne perdiderim quemquam sine caede meorum,
Tu quoque uulnus habes.
- (18) August. *Conf.* iii. 1 conligabar laetus aerumnosis nexi-
bus, ut caederer uirgis ferreis ardentibus zeli.
- (19) August. *Conf.* iii. 3 In quantas iniquitates distabui et
sacrilega curiositate secutus sum ut deserentem te deduceret
me ad ima infida . . .
- (20) August. *Conf.* iii. 6 At tu amor meus, in quem deficio
ut fortis sim.
- (21) August. *Conf.* iv. 2 sed unam tamen [mulierem habe-

bam] ei quoque seruans tori fidem, in qua sane experirer exemplo meo, quid distaret . . .

- (22) August. *Conf.* v. 2 Sed fugerunt, ut non uiderent te uidentem se atque excaecati in te offenderent.
- (23) August. *Conf.* v. 13 ego ipse ambiui per eos ipsos manichaeis uanitatibus ebrios — quibus ut carerem ibam, sed utrique nesciebamus.
- (24) August. *Conf.* vi. 8 qui [clamor] per eius aures intrauit et reserauit eius lumina, ut esset, qua feriretur et deiceretur animus.
- (25) August. *Ciu. Dei* i. 1 . . . eius nomini resistunt corde peruerso, ut sempiternis tenebris puniantur.

We are now in a position to consider dubious cases, in regard to which one might wish to decide between (a) ordinary consecutive clause; (b) ordinary final clause indicating real purpose on the part of the main actor; (c) rhetorical final; (d) *uoluntas fati*.

- (26) Virg. *Aen.* xi. 416 ff.
 Ille mihi ante alios fortunatusque laborum
 Egregiusque animi, qui ne quid tale uideret
 Procubuit moriens et humum semel ore momordit.
- (27) Virg. *Aen.* xii. 641 f.
 Occidit infelix nostrum ne dedecus Vfens
 Aspiceret.

The Ladewig-Schaper-Deuticke edition takes these as final clauses of destiny. Conington's translation as well as Jackson's regards the purpose as directly the purpose of the main actor, and seems to be supported by the phrase '*egregius animi*.' Servius on Book xii says: 'fortasse uiueret, nisi ideo uoluisset occumbere, ne nos uictos uideret.'

- (28) Prop. i. 8. 13 ff.
 Atque ego non uideam talis subsidere uentos
 Cum tibi prouectas auferet unda ratis,
 Vt me defixum uacua patiat in ora
 Crudelem infesta saepe uocare manu!

I take it that 'ut . . . patiat' is poetically regarded as the

purpose of the winds, and that there is no purpose of destiny alluded to in these lines. One may usefully contrast Homer *Il.* xxii. 328 f.

οὐδ' ἄρ' ἀπ' ἀσφάραγον μελή τάμε χαλκοβάρεια,
ὄφρα τί μιν προτιείποι ἀμειβόμενος ἐπέεσσιν,

where the balance of opinion and probability leans the other way.

(29) Ovid *Trist.* i. 2. 41 f.

O bene, quod non sum mecum conscendere passus,
Ne mihi mors misero bis patienda foret.

This might be plain direct purpose, or might represent Ovid as the agent of destiny.

(30) Curtius viii. 2. 9 Et ego, seruatorum meorum latro, reuertar in patriam, ut ne dexteram quidem nutrici sine memoria calamitatis eius offerre possim!

In most writers this would be regarded as plain consequence; but Curtius is so fond of the 'rhetorical final' and the 'uoluntas fati' that it is almost certainly one of these. In any case the expression is forced.

(31) Tac. *Hist.* i. 38 Ac ne qua saltem in successore Galbae spes esset, accersit ab exilio quem tristitia et auaritia sui simillimum iudicabat.

(32) Tac. *Ann.* xiv. 16 Ne tamen ludicrae tantum imperatoris artes notescerent, carminum quoque studium adfectauit, contractis quibus aliqua pangendi facultas necdum insignis erat.

These two passages should be studied together. Tacitus does not mean that the purpose was in the mind of Galba or in the mind of Nero. The bare ideas are: 'We have no hope in Galba's successor, for he has summoned from exile . . .' 'It was not merely by his stage performances that the emperor became famous: for he interested himself (genuinely) in poetry as well.' The final clauses are only rhetorical spice and garnishing.

(33) Tac. *Ann.* xiv. 7 At Neroni nuntios patrati facinoris opperienti adfertur euasisse ictu leui sauciam et hactenus adito discrimine ne auctor dubitaretur.

Furneaux, after suggesting that *ne* = *ut non*, continues: 'It is

not impossible to suppose, with Mr. Frost, that some ironical idea of purpose is conveyed, i. e. that the plot seemed to have been expressly arranged to show Nero's guilt.' This means, I suppose, 'ironical' purpose on the part of the main actors, and one might compare Caes. B. G. v. 31. 5 *Omnia excogitantur, quare nec sine periculo maneatur et languore militum et uigi-
liis periculum augeatur*,—where the verbs following *quare* are almost certainly final in force. On the other hand, the Nipperdey-Andresen edition refers the Tacitus passage to the purpose of destiny.

(34) Apul. *Met.* v. 24 *te coniugem meam feci, ut bestia scilicet tibi uiderer, et ferro caput excideres meum.*

This passage is remarkable for the presence of *scilicet*: if any one thinks that this makes the ironical sense overshadow all else, he is welcome to class it as 'rhetorical-ironical.' Cp. the passage from Apuleius in Additional Note A.

One or two considerations remain. We started with an infinitive of destiny in English, of the type 'only to be hanged on it himself.' Can this be regarded as an infinitive of purpose? The answer is, 'For present-day ideas, no.' Whatever may have been the origin of these infinitives in English, to-day they are felt to be closer akin to result than to purpose.

'Full many a flower is born to blush unseen,'

'When we two parted to sever for years,'

'He lived to attain the age of eighty,'

all belong to the same class. The infinitive has, on the whole, more commonly a final sense: and generally, when we allude to the thwarting influence of destiny, we insert the word 'only,' which, though it retains its original meaning, yet serves mainly to remind the reader that the infinitive is not one of ordinary purpose: we wish to distinguish clearly and immediately between 'He returned home to die' (i. e. in order to die at home and not among strangers), and 'He returned home (safe from the war) only to die (of typhoid).'

In German, on the other hand, there is nothing but the context to show the difference between an expression of genuine purpose, e. g. 'Er schickte den Knecht um das Pferd zu holen,' and an expression like 'Er kehrte wohlbehalten aus dem Kriege

zurück, um bald darauf am Typhus zu sterben.' Most authorities would agree that the latter exemplifies a construction which originally denoted purpose, but now definitely denotes consequence. One writer on the subject deserves to be quoted:⁶ 'The infinitives with *to* in English and *um zu* in German are here employed to denote a result which is the natural outcome of events or plans independent of the action described in the principal proposition, while they elsewhere denote a result as the effect of the activity or state indicated in the governing proposition. While the use of *to* and *um zu* here is contrary to the general principle observed in clauses of result, it should be regarded as a valuable modification and extension of this principle, which should be encouraged rather than discouraged, as it is one of the tersest and most expressive constructions known to either language.'

Be that as it may—and I for one cannot subscribe to every word⁷—the fact that such infinitival expressions describing destiny or later lot are consecutive or virtually consecutive in English and German, does not decide any issue between consecutive and final in Latin. Surely a language is autonomous; and any such construction must be judged by the groupings and connexions within the language, not by the rule of thumb that what is good enough for one tongue is good enough for another. Not a few English infinitives of destiny could, I think, pass into a plain consecutive subjunctive in Latin⁸; others into *ita . . . ut . . .*; others would find a far more effective equivalent in an entirely different idiom. My object has been to justify the belief that some mordant Latin pens have, on good occasion, expressed such ideas by a final clause. And good occasion is everything. 'Non enim ex omni ligno, ut Pythagoras dicebat, debet Mercurius exsculpi.'

⁶ G. O. Curme, *A Grammar of the German Language* (1905) p. 603 Note. If one presses back to the origins, J. Grimm's account of *zu* and *um zu* in his *Deutsche Grammatik* IV. Theil² (1898) p. 121 is worth consulting.

⁷ The precisians in Germany itself dislike the lavish use of *um zu*: cp. H. Paul, *Deutsche Grammatik* (1920) IV § 345, and G. Wustmann, *Allerhand Sprachdummheiten*³ (1903) pp. 161 f.

⁸ I. e. where it represents a sufficiently direct result of the 'activity or state indicated in the governing proposition' e. g. 'parted to sever for years.'

ADDITIONAL NOTE A.

Rhetorical-final clauses (in ironical sense).

One group of passages deserves a special note. The construction (see Dahl pp. 191 ff.) '*ut* consecutive without correlation i. e. introductory word in principal clause,' is so very common in Latin that there is a strong temptation to decide hastily for *it* in spite of a lurking feeling that it is not a full explanation. It may happen that *ut* consecutive is, though humdrum, yet logically tolerable, and that *ut* final, introducing a plain straightforward purpose, is beset with logical difficulties. But may not the real account be that *ut* is *rhetorical-final*, denoting 'ironical' purpose (virtually = 'as though the intention were') or a similar shade of meaning? Or in some instances should we express it thus, that the person who wills the main action must be supposed to will its inevitable and perhaps foreseen accompaniments, and that Latin is well content in the rhetorical context to express the idea that these accompaniments are the purpose of the main action? I subjoin a few instances, in all of which the rhetorical tone is evident, to show the range of such an explanation: needless to say, the idea of *uoluntas fati* is not present in any of them.

Catull lxxiii. 52 f. ad Idae tetuli nemora pedem,
Vt aput niuem et ferarum gelida stabula forem.

Prop. iii. 16. 5 f.

Quid faciam? obductis committam mene tenebris,
Vt timeam audaces in mea membra manus?

[Professor Phillimore suggests that the expression here is perhaps influenced by the construction *committere ut* = to risk.]
Seneca *Ben.* vii. 9. 5 hae [uestes] ingenti summa ab ignotis
etiam ad commercium gentibus accersuntur, ut matronae
nostrae ne adulteris quidem plus sui in cubiculo, quam in
publico ostendant.

Apul. *Met.* v. 29 Honesta haec . . ut primum quidem, tuae
parentis, immo dominae praecepta calcares, nec sordidis
amoribus inimicam meam cruciaries, uerum etiam hoc aetatis
puer tuis licentiosis et immaturis iungeres amplexibus, ut ego
norum scilicet tolerarem inimicam?

ADDITIONAL NOTE B.

Difficult instances of the use of *Ne*.

The formula *ne* = *ut non* is, or has been, an obsession in certain quarters, an explanation so all-embracing that some index-makers punctually record it after *in hoc* or *ea lege*, deceiving even the elect! An attempt has been made (e. g. by Nipperdey and the Gerber and Greef *Lexicon Taciteum*) to correct the formula by employing, and sometimes by unduly forcing, the idea of prevention. I may therefore be pardoned for printing, under appropriate heads, a selection of the most difficult passages involved. In general I would say (1) that Ciceronian and Livian usage is probably not so strictly orthodox, and later usage not so heterodox, as the *obiter dicta* of certain grammarians would lead us to suppose; (2) that there is no violent break in the development of the later usage; (3) that various simple explanations, which 'leap to the eyes' when the true parallels are quoted, appear not to have been thought of.—The defender of nuances of meaning must sometimes admit a disappointment in an author or passage: but common sense will continue to urge that the escape of one or two sheep through the hedge does not warrant us in deciding that the hedge might as well not be there, or in giving up the attempt to detain as many sheep as we can.

i. The idea of permission or concession.

1. Ovid *Met.* xii. 202 Da femina ne sim.
(Cf. Quintil. *Inst. Orat.* xii. 10. 47, Tac. *Ann.* iii. 23.)
2. Tac. *Ann.* xiv. 14 quos . . ne nominatim tradam, maioribus eorum tribuendum puto.
3. Lucifer Calarit. (Vienna Corpus vol. XIV p. 279. 15) Numquid adquiescendum (= concedendum) tibi erit ne apostoli praetermissa fuisse uideantur praecepta? (Cp. Sid. Apoll. *Epist.* v. 19. 2.)

In the light of these it is simple to explain—

4. Seneca *Ben.* iii. 22. 4. ne a seruo acceperis, in tua potestate est.

ii. The idea of intention, effort, or control.

- a) after *facere* and its compounds; also *esse*; often passing into the idea of prevention.

1. Livy ii. 45. 12 Ego istos . . posse uincere scio; uelle ne scirem ipsi fecerunt.
2. Val. Max. vi. 4. 3 rex adfirmavit fore ne amplius de se Ptolemaeus quereretur (probably = curaturum).
3. Celsus iii. 14 Sic enim fore ne septimo die febris accedat.
4. Celsus iii. 17 saepe fit ne febris accedat.

[In both passages, Celsus has just suggested a mode of treatment.]

5. Tac. Agr. 6 fecit [so codd.: Heinsius effecit] ne cuius alterius sacrilegium res publica quam Neronis sensisset.

The following are harder to defend:—

6. Val. Max. i. 1. 8. futurum enim, si quid prodigii in ea accidisset, ne dinosceretur, utri rem diuinam fieri oporteret. [Perhaps idea of 'prevention': perhaps the *ne* must be surrendered as colourless.]
7. Tertullian Apol. 8 Sequitur . . . ne ultra uelis id te esse quod, si prius esses, non fuisses. ['Prevention'? Or *sequitur ne* = *efficitur ne*, and the *ne* colourless?]

(b) after *consulere*.

1. Ter. Phorm. 468 f. illi certe consuleres, ne quid . . . poteretur mali.
- (2. Cic. Verr. iii. 16 ne pupillo tutores propinquire consularent quominus fortunis omnibus euerteretur.)
3. Tac. Ann. xii. 47 uisui consuluit, ne coram interficeret.
- (4. August. Ciu. Dei iv. 5 multum eis consultum est, ut . . . poenas debitas cogitare desisterent . . .)

[Nipperdey's note on Tac. runs: 'Vor *ne* ist gedacht "dadurch dass er sich hütete"'. But the construction in the four passages seems certainly to be *consulere* + *alicui* + *ut* (*ne*, *quominus*) 'in the interest of some person or thing to take measures so that . . .']

(c) after verbs of attaining and earning.

1. Vell. ii. 12. 5 Hac uictoria uidetur meruisse Marius ne eius nati rem publicam paeniteret.
2. Seneca De ira ii. 12. 4 Quidam ne unquam riderent consecuti sunt.
3. Pliny N. H. xxxv. 8 mentiri clarorum imagines erat aliquis uirtutum amor multoque honestius quam mereri ne

quis suas expeteret. [This last is strained: but *dignus qui* is regarded by many as introducing a *final* subjunctive.]

(d) after *moderari*.

Tac. *Ann.* i. 15 moderante Tiberio ne plures quam quattuor candidatos commendaret.

(e) after verbs of happening (again passing into the idea of prevention, and sometimes shading off into the idea of *uoluntas fati*).

1. Cic. *De Div.* ii. 21 nihil est pro certo futurum, quod potest aliqua procuracione accidere [= procurari] ne fiat.
2. Livy i. 46. 5 Forte ita inciderat, ne duo uiolenta ingenia matrimonio iungerentur, fortuna credo populi Romani [= fortuna p. R. factum erat ne (Weissenb.)].
3. Frontinus *Strateg.* i. Praef. continget (after effort) ne de euentu trepidet inuentionis suae . . .
4. Val. Max. vii. 4. 4 Quo euenit ne Hasdrubal . . prius sciret [by providential guidance and the skill of Saliator].
5. Seneca *Ep.* 76. 19 uirtus, cui iam accidere, ne sit bonum, non potest ['cannot be prevented'? Cp. Plaut. *Pers.* 175 potin, ut taceas? potin, ne moneas? Or is the *ne* colourless?].

iii. The idea of prevention, so far as not already dealt with.

1. Cic. *Font.* 36 Magna . . causa . . haec est ne quae macula suscipiatur. (Cp. Livy xxxiv. 39. 9.)
2. Tac. *Hist.* iii. 39 parum effugerat ne dignus crederetur.
3. Lactantius *Div. Inst.* v. 13. 2 Sed illi malitia et furore caecantur ne uideant. [Perhaps a notion of *uoluntas Dei*.]
4. August. *Conf.* v. 8 audiebam adulescentes . . ordinatiore disciplinae coercitione sedari, ne in scholam . . proterue inruant.

iv. Epexegetic, still giving the idea of intention and control.

(a) after demonstrative pronoun and noun.

Seneca Rh. *Controu.* ix. 5 (28) 13 seruauit hunc colorem ne quid in nouercam diceret.

(b) after noun, without demonstrative pronoun.

1. Tac. *Hist.* iii. 82 Ratio cunctandi, ne asperatus proelio miles non populo . . . consuleret.

2. Tac. *Ann.* xii. 32 destinationis certum ne noua moliretur.

In the light of these one can explain—

3. Tac. *Ann.* xi. 15 Benignitati deum gratiam referendam ne ritus sacrorum . . . oblitterarentur.

[Nipperdey's note: '*ne* "dadurch, dass man verhüte dass" "dadurch dass man . . nicht in Vergessenheit geraten lasse,"' probably implies an ellipse, and a forcing of the idea of prevention. I take the *ne* . . *oblitterarentur* as epexegetic of *gratiam*. If the objection is raised that one would expect (in Tacitus) a demonstrative pronoun with *gratiam*, one may contrast with each other *Hist.* iv. 8 *Id magis uitandum ne . . . irritaretur animus*, and *Ann.* xiii. 49 *an solum emendatione dignum, ne Syracusis spectacula largius ederentur?*]^o

ROBERT G. NISBET.

UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW, SCOTLAND.

^o I owe warm thanks to Mr. C. J. Fordyce and Mr. Archibald Cameron, both of Balliol College, Oxford, who have collected several of the passages mentioned in this article, and suggested points of view.

III.—THE SECOND NECYIA AGAIN.

Professor Bury has recently¹ assured us that the case against the concluding episodes of the *Odyssey*, that is, from ψ 296 onwards, is 'purely literary.'² This reminds the present writer that in defending the Second Necyia on purely literary grounds,³ only part of what was in his mind was presented. This was the argument that ω 1-204 marks clearly at the end of the tale the contrast, suggested in the introduction of the poem, between the family of Odysseus and that of Agamemnon,⁴ and at the same time takes fitting leave of Penelope and gives her the due meed of praise. I now wish to offer other literary arguments which seem to me to make the *Second Necyia* one of the neatest incidents in the conclusion of any long story. This episode has always been a favorite of mine; hence if the passage is treated in the spirit rather of the advocate than of the critic, due allowance should be made.

Two points repeatedly made against ω 1-204 are (1) that it contains an undue proportion of repeated verses and parts of verses, and (2) that at the same time there are words, phrases, constructions, facts, etc., 'not elsewhere found in the *Odyssey*' or 'in Homer.' This reminds one of the way in which a Vermont clergyman once characterized Calvinism:

"You can and you can't.
You will and you wont.
You'll be damned if you do!
You'll be damned if you don't!"⁵

¹ J. H. S. XLII (1922), 1-15.

² Mr. Shewan in *Class. Phil.* VIII 261 ff., IX 35 ff., 160 ff., has done most to make it so.

³ *Class. Jour.* XIII (1918), 521 ff. Professor Bury had not read this article, nor had he noticed Professor Scott's admirable remarks on the literary appropriateness of ω 205-548 (*Class. Jour.* XII [1917], 397 ff.).

⁴ It is pleasant to notice that Mr. Sheppard reaches a similar conclusion. The present writer had previously called brief attention to this (*Class. Weekly*, V [1912], 219 ff.).

⁵ This illustration has been used by the writer in an essay on *Homeric Criticism* (*Sewanee Review* for October-December, 1922). I am indebted for it to the Honorable G. W. Bailey, president of the University of Vermont.

Now there are two justifications of the repeated passages. First, the flagging power of the poet. It is natural that his genius should flag after 27,000 verses, and that it should not flash out with the fire and the effectiveness of the first book of the Iliad. But, secondly, we must also allow for the flagging of the attention of the auditors. The excitement of the episodes immediately preceding has been intense. The poet has only one emotional situation in the conclusion of his tale, the meeting between the long-parted father and son. A little relaxing of the tension just before this will do no harm; and relaxation is obtained by repeating the familiar, which requires the least attention to follow it.

On the other hand, it must be admitted that the new which we find is both good and worthy of Homer, e. g., (1) the new detail added in the third telling of Penelope's trick of the web, of the exhibition to the Suitors of the newly-washed shroud—it was badly in need of washing after having been on the loom for three years—, and the fine simile, likewise used for the third time in the poem. The objection that in view of β 110 the completion of the shroud could not have coincided with the return of Odysseus will not, we think, be generally made in the present days of Homeric criticism, and seems absurd when taken in connection with τ 157. (2) That Odysseus and Telemachus arranged, at the steading of Eumaeus, the plot to slay the Suitors, and that Odysseus suggested to Penelope the contest of the bow, are quite according to ἦθος: this is just what a suitor would have concluded; besides, Odysseus did actually tell Penelope to hold the contest (compare ω 167 f. with τ 584). (3) Hayman calls attention to the comment of the Schol. on ω 74, that Dionysus might well make a gift to Thetis in return for her care of him when fleeing from Lycurgus (Z 136). (4) The concluding line (vs. 204), in which we bid farewell to the Suitors and to the two heroes of the Iliad, albeit only the tag is new, is finely Homeric in its brevity and its emotional connotation.

Our passage (vss. 1-204) also offers three illustrations of a feature of style which Aristarchus himself (who condemns the episode) used as the test of Homericity. This is the so-called *δεύτερον* (or *ὑστέρον*) *πρότερον ἀπάντησις*, or chiastic arrangement

of ideas.⁶ (1) In the conversation between Agamemnon and Amphimedon, the former says: a. "How did you (the Suitors) meet your fate?" b. "Tell me in answer to my question." c. "Do you not remember me?" Amphimedon replies in the reverse order: c. "I remember you well." b. "I will relate to you the evil issue of our death." a. "We were wooing the wife of Odysseus."⁷

(2) vss. 161-163, *ἔπεσιν τε κακοῖσιν ἐνίσσομεν ἡδὲ βολῆσιν* (*βαλλόμενος καὶ ἐνισσόμενος*).

(3) ψ 370-372, ω 1, 9, *ἦρχε, ἐξῆγε* (*ἐξεκαλεῖτο, ἦρχε*).

This chiasmic juncture of the *Second Necyia* with the end of ψ suggests the setting of the former passage in its context. Professor Bury does not see the strength of the analogy to the *Teichoskopia*, which Rothe noticed;⁸ but the episode certainly can be justified as occupying the time that Odysseus and his companions take to go from the city to the farm of Laertes. And there is at least a slight bit of evidence that in ν the poet foreshadows the account of the going of the souls to Hades. As I hope to show in a paper to be published later, in Homer's reference to death there is a marked difference between the purely narrative parts of the poems and the speeches. When the poet himself refers to the death of a character he does not regularly say that the soul went to Hades, and if he does say this, he seems to have a reason in all but two cases. For example, the poet himself tells us that the soul of Patroclus 'was gone to Hades' (Π 856). And later he uses this fact in connection with the dream of Achilles (Ψ 65 ff.). He uses the same expression when telling of the death of Hector, for reasons which I shall not discuss here, but which seem sufficient. Again, Odysseus in the Apologue, which except in some details is in the style of the narrative, says that the soul of Elpenor 'went down to Hades,' and later we meet this soul there (κ 560, λ 51). So in the prophesy of Theoclymenus (ν 350 ff.) the seer sees the souls of the Suitors *ιμένωνων Ἐρεβόσδε ὑπὸ ζόφον*. Is not

⁶ The present writer discussed this at length in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, XXXI (1920), 39-62.

⁷ Cf. op. cit. pp. 45 ff.; *Pap. Ox. VIII* (1911), no. 1086, and *Schol. A.* on B 763.

⁸ *Od. als Dichtung*, 186, anm. 1.

this a *προαναφώνησις*, either intentional or unconscious—because the *Second Necyia* was already conceived in the mind of the poet?

Let us now consider the literary qualities of the *Second Necyia* in a more general way. First, the symmetry of form is noticeable. The whole passage is purely dramatic after the introduction (vss. 1-14). The latter is excellent. Hermes and his magic wand are necessary. We have forgotten about the souls of the Suitors; they are, as it were, static (for reasons excellently given by Rothe (*op. cit.*, 186 ff.) in the *aithousa* of the well-walled courtyard, and it takes the rod of Hermes, which awakens the sleeping—and sleep is the brother of death—to make them, one might say, kinetic, cf. *ἐγείρει . . . κινήσας*, vss. 4-5. The simile of the bats is both effective and quite in the Homeric manner, with its three-fold repetition, *τρίζουσαι, τρίζουσαι, τετριγυῖαι*, and the *ἀκροτελεύτιον* (vs. 8). Likewise the details of the journey, the stream of Oceanus and the Rock Leucas—whatever that was; doubtless the audience understood—the Gates of the Sun and the Precinct of Dreams, all are highly poetic and worthy of the only description in the two poems of the last journey of a soul. What if nowadays we query how the unburied could cross Acheron? Ask Hermes, if you insist on such meticulous hermeneutic of the passage. The poet wanted the souls of the Suitors in the vicinity of the dead heroes and he gets them there.

Then follow five speeches, symmetrically arranged with regard to length, content and formulaic verses, as follows:—

(In the Asphodel Meadow are seen conversing Achilles, Antilochus, Patroclus and Ajax. To them enters Agamemnon with his body-guard, slain by Aegisthus and his men in ambush. Achilles loquitur.)

(The Suitors approach, led by Hermes; Agamemnon and Achilles go to meet them,* the former recognizing one of the Suitors. Agamemnon loquitur.)

*The use of the dual in vs. 101, so far as I recall, has not been noticed. It is only the shades of Achilles and Agamemnon who hear the story of the success of Odysseus in slaying the Suitors, and the praise which Agamemnon bestows on the fidelity and shrewdness of Penelope. Vs. 101, with a delicacy worthy of Homer, eliminates Ajax. The latter can well listen to the praise of Achilles, but to hear his hated rival lauded, the one to whom even after death he would not

- A. vss. 24-34. Achilles speaks. 11 verses.
- B. vss. 36-97. Agamemnon speaks. 62 verses.
- C. vss. 106-119. Agamemnon speaks. 14 verses.
- D. vss. 121-190. Amphimedon speaks. 70 verses.
- E. vss. 192-202. Agamemnon speaks. 11 verses.

The symmetry is seen at a glance. The body of the episode consists of two narratives of about the same length (62 and 70 vss., respectively), each preceded by an introductory speech. The first two and last two speeches form contrasting pairs, chiasmatically arranged, with the central speech as a connecting link (AB-C-DE). The two pairs have each the same theme, *κλέος*, on the one hand of Achilles, on the other of Odysseus. In the shorter speeches of either pair (A and E), the fame of the two heroes is contrasted with the inglorious end of the commander-in-chief of the forces at Troy. In the first of them (A) Achilles comments on Agamemnon's lack of *κλέος*, and this suggests, by contrast, the famous end of Achilles; in the second (E), after one of the victims of the most famous *coup* of the ἀνὴρ πολύτροπος has given the facts on which his fame will be based, the fame is recognized by the one who, at intervals in the poem, has been used as a foil to Odysseus. And this fame is heightened and is employed also to serve as a graceful farewell to Penelope by assigning as a chief reason for the hero's glory the virtues of his wife. What could be more worthy of a great poet than this arrangement of material in the epilogue of his tale of Odysseus?

But we can go farther than this. Professor Scott¹⁰ pointed out how in the final episodes of ω, as well as in Ω, the story returns to its beginning in some formal details and in other ways, epilogue thus balancing prologue. This 'periodic' char-

acter of the poem, if it is to be maintained, would be highly inappropriate. In a similar way, as the present writer has remarked (*Class. Quarterly*, XII [1919], 1-3), Homer removes all but the two old nurses and the husband and wife from the recognition scene in ψ. I am glad to notice that E. Gaar, who apparently had not read my article, has recently pointed out the same explanation of the dancing after the Slaughter (*Wiener Blätter f. d. altsprachl. Unterricht*, 1921, 6 ff. See *Phil. Woch.* XLII [1922], 811).

¹⁰ *Class. Jour.* XII (1917), 397 ff.

acteristic seems to be found in the *Second Necyia*, if we notice an emphatic personal pronoun and a verbal echo, at the beginning and the end of the speech of Amphimedon. In the conclusion of his narrative the Ithacan prince says (vs. 186):

ὥς ἡμεῖς, 'Αγάμεμνον, ἀπωλόμεθ'.

Why the emphatic ἡμεῖς, unless for contrast, and with 'Αγάμεμνον, rather than with Odysseus, who with some god for his helper (vs. 182) was never in danger of destruction? Again, the account of the Slaughter, which is summed up in ὥς (vs. 186), begins (vs. 125) with the words,

μνώμεθ' 'Οδυσσῆος δὴν οἰχομένοιο δάμαρτα.

The poet seems to make Amphimedon imply, 'As *we* perished by the hand of the man whose wife we were wooing, so *you* fell a victim of the one who wooed your wife.' This recalls the words of Zeus and of Athena in *a*. Zeus says: "We warned Aegisthus not to woo the wife of Agamemnon," and Athena replies:

ὥς ἀπόλοιτο καὶ ἄλλος ὅτις τοιαῦτά γε ῥέζοι.

It is a fair inference, when we consider the context,¹¹ that in the mind of Athena ἄλλος has some reference at least to the Suitors.

The conclusion of the *Odyssey*—I prefer to call it the epilogue—also serves as the epilogue of the *two* Homeric poems. The account of the burial of Achilles seems tedious to many readers. But so is any epilogue. The exciting part of the story is over. Why not ring down the curtain at once? "Must we put the bride to bed?" asks Sir Walter Scott in the epilogue of one of his novels. Yet an epilogue is due to the tale. It must prove in words that the outcome of the events is their logical result. The story demands this. Elsewhere¹² the writer has pointed out the indications that the *Odyssey* is essentially the sequel to the *Iliad*. For example, the poet is interested rather in the heroes who fought at Troy than in the next generation. The story of the death and burial of Achilles avoids

¹¹ Cf. once more *Class. Jour.* XIII, 522, and *Class. Wkly.* V, 219 f.

¹² *Sewanee Review*, XXVIII (1920), 170.

leaving at loose ends one of the threads of the Iliad. This is the Choice of Achilles and its results. Fate has willed that he be short-lived above the others—he is the only one of the nine great heroes who dies in battle before Ilios. But this early death comes about directly from his own choice, as is made clear in I and Σ. He chooses κλέος and a short life to a long life without glory. This outcome the Iliad only foreshadows; it does not and cannot describe it. Wilamowitz's supposed original ending of the Iliad is unthinkable except as an anti-climax, in view of the part which the poet has assigned to Hector. It is the death of Hector, because of his part in that of Patroclus, that must furnish the climax. And yet a proper epilogue would, we think, take care not to leave unnoticed this important, though minor, strand in the network of the plot. Hence the narrative of Agamemnon, tiresome as it may be to some readers, is quite in place—in an epilogue. The κλέος of the hero is complete. He died fighting. Gods and men mourned him. His funeral was such as no other prince was given; to cite one feature, it lasted twice as long as that of Hector. His bones were placed in a divinely-wrought amphora, along with those of Patroclus—as he wished. And, finally, his tomb was a tall and shapely mound in the most conspicuous part of the plain, where every mariner entering the famous straits could see it, οἱ νῦν γεγάσι καὶ οἱ μετόπισθεν ἔσσονται—even in the twentieth century A. D.

Again, the only injury to the κλέος of Achilles was inflicted by Agamemnon, and the latter, in the Iliad, never made verbal amends. Nestor admits that the commander-in-chief has offered in atonement for the slight to the hero's honor material compensation beyond criticism, but he implies that he has not made the *amende honorable* (I 164, δῶρα μὲν οὐκέτ' ὄνοστὰ διδοῖς Ἄχιλῃ ἀνακτι—μέν is significant). And even in the Reconciliation in T, the king merely admits that he, like Zeus, suffered a temporary mental aberration under the influence of Ἄτη; he does not in so many words concede that Achilles was in the right. And the latter in accepting the offer of reconciliation refers only to the gifts (T 147, δῶρα μὲν—again the particle), without the least suggestion of moral atonement. But in our passage the king formally and fully attests the glory of Achilles,

and heightens it by contrast with his own ignoble end (ω 36 f. and 93 ff., the beginning and the conclusion of his narrative):

*Ολβιε Πηλέος νιέ, ὅς θάνες ἐν Τροίῃ

ὥς σὺ μὲν οὐδὲ θανὼν ὄνομ' ὤλεσας, ἀλλὰ τοι αἰεὶ

πάντας ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους κ λ έ ο ς ἔσσεται ἐσθλόν, Ἀχιλλεῦ.

αὐτὰρ ἐμοί, κτλ.

That is to say, "I returned home, as you did not; but not for a long life, which you might have had if you had chosen, nor to honor, which you did gain." All this may not be very interesting to the reader to-day, but it is appropriate—and this is the point—to the epilogue of a sequel.

And, finally, as the two long speeches of the *Second Necyia* assign renown to the heroes of the two poems, and do this through the utterance of the persons by whom an effort was made to take away from that renown,—and in the *Odyssey*, also through the lips of the one who with his family served as a foil throughout the poem—so in the final episode of the poem there is a striking contrast to the last book of the *Iliad*. I think that all will admit that no matter what may be the shortcomings of ω , the meeting between Laertes and Odysseus is fine poetry, both in conception and in execution. The poet's genius is not flagging here. Now in Ω , aside from the lament of Helen, which so stirred the heart of Tom Brown's friend Arthur that he could not find his voice, there is no more pathetic passage than the one in which Priam and Achilles recall to mind their dear ones, the former the son who is dead, the latter the father whom he is never to see again. Is not this a companion picture to the reunion of father and son in the orchard, beside the trees which the son in his childhood had planted? The pathos of the latter scene is as deep as that of the other one in the *Iliad*, but the tears are tears of joy. The sequel ends happily—except for Agamemnon, who in the introduction to the first part of the story shows that he does not deserve good fortune.

In estimating the pertinence of what I have tried to make clear in the preceding paragraphs, it must be remembered that no attempt has been made to show that Homer *consciously* arranged and put into verse all that I have pointed out. One

cannot believe that the poet worked in such a cold-blooded and calculating way as Poe says that he himself did in composing *The Raven*. But the essence of genius is to harmonize all its material, not necessarily in a pragmatic and factual manner, for in reality it cares little for fact *qua* fact, but in a poetic and literary harmony. Greek poetry demanded an emotional, if not a pragmatic, epilogue. We have this in Attic tragedy, and we have it in the *Iliad*. This is all that the writer claims as the literary justification of the first part of the conclusion of the *Odyssey*: it is an emotional epilogue, a harmonizing of the emotions that have been aroused in the *Iliad* and in its sequel, the *Odyssey*.

SAMUEL E. BASSETT.

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT.

IV.—ON THE APPENDIX VERGILIANA.

To Professor Tenney Frank our thanks are due for shewing Virgil's continuation at Naples of his studies in the metropolis. Previously we had supposed Rome to be the scene of all the *Catalepta*; now we can share these student-songs between Rome and Naples.

Professor Prescott has done well to call attention (in *Class. Phil.* 1922, p. 275) to some weak links in the 'Combinations-forschung' of *Virgil, a Biography*. They do not make the book less welcome. I too have a fault to find in it.

In a note on p. 131 we read "The *Lydia* cannot be the famous poem of that name written by Valerius Cato; it is too slight and ineffectual to be identified with that work." Here I find the taint of German scepticism, as Professor Prescott finds elsewhere the taint of German imaginativeness. Why must we suppose the *Lydia* to have been a μέγα βιβλίον? Ineffectual! Well, it has suffered at the hands of Time, and even in its pristine beauty it was eclipsed, or rather snuffed out of existence (almost), by the *Eclogues*, some thirty years later. But look at it fairly, without a side-glance at Virgil, take it for what it was—the first attempt to imitate in Latin the Greek pastoral poetry.

Invideo vobis, agri formosaque prata,
Hoc formosa magis mea quod formosa puella
St! vobis tacite nostrum suspirat amorem.

'I envy you, fields and meadows fair, the more fair that 'tis to you my fair—hush!—is sighing low her love for me.' I am a more indulgent critic than Professor Frank. I call that not bad for a first attempt to capture in Latin the cadence of lines like

Ἄδύ τι τὸ ψιθύρισμα καὶ ἃ πίτυς, αἰπόλε, τήνα,
Ἄ ποτὶ ταῖς παγαῖσι μελίσσεται, ἄδὼ δὲ καὶ τύ
Συρίσδες· μετὰ Πᾶνα τὸ δεύτερον ἄθλον ἀποισῇ.

Vos nunc illa videt, vobis mea Ludia ludit,
Vos nunc alloquitur, vos nunc arridet ocellis
Et mea submissa meditatur carmina voce.

Ineffectual! Too paltry to take young Rome by storm! Why, Mr. Housman's *Last Poems* are taking young (and old) London

by storm; and, much as I admire them, I do not read them with the same pleasure as these Latin lines.

And how, without jettison of commonsense, can Professor Frank meet the argument stated (not for the first time) in the *Classical Review* (1918, p. 62): "No rival or imitator would steal the name Lydia for the heroine; that name was by literary convention the property of Valerius Cato as much as 'Highland Mary' is the inalienable property of Burns." Away with that German 'Geist der stets verneint,' that evil spirit which so often repels us as we read Norden's brilliant, too brilliant, pages.

However, I must not here inflict on the reader all the columns of my *Classical Review* article. Let me rather ask him to correct two errors in it. In *Lyd.* 70 *illi* is the old-fashioned form of *illic* 'there.' And beside this old usage may be put *que* (*Lyd.* 48) in the sense of *quoque* (see Friedrich's Note on *Catull.* 102, 3 *meque*). To me certainly the poem suggests something half-a-century earlier than Professor Frank's "neurotic and sentimental pupil of Propertius."

To pass to Virgilian poems. The palmary emendation has come from Professor Birt, and, like most palmary emendations, it is a return to the traditional text (*Catal.* 1, 1):

De qua saepe tibi venit, sed, Tucca, videre
Non licet: oculitur limine clausa viri.

This had been altered (by Scaliger, of all people!) to *Delia saepe tibi*. What a change the true meaning makes! *De qua saepe tibi* (scil. locutus sum) *venit* 'SHE has come.' How it gives us a glimpse at Virgil's student-days!

I do wish that editors would cease tampering with *Catal.* 2, 4 *tau Gallicum*. Any student of Celtic knows that this *must* be right: *tau*, the Celtic verb 'I am,' the *tha* of Gaelic, the *tā* of Irish, the equivalent of Latin *sto*, originally *stāyō*, (whence Late Latin *stātus*, Fr. *été*). And why all this argument over *Catal.* 7?

Si licet, hoc sine fraude, Vari dulcissime, dicam:
'Dispercam, nisi me perdidit iste Πόθος.'
Sin autem praecepta vetant me dicere, sane
Non dicam sed: 'me perdidit iste puer.'

Varius called his Greek house-page Πόθος. The *praecepta*, the rules of the rhetoric-class forbade the use of Greek words among Latin. So Vergil must substitute *puer*.

In the unpleasant Catal. 13 every touch of the picture, every word of the 'agentia verba Lycamben' is designed to heighten our disgust. So I suggest *hirtulam* in line 21. (For the gender cf. line 17.) In most minuscule script *hi-* is indistinguishable from *in*, and *in rtulam* would be sure to become the *in rotulam* and *in ratulam* of our MSS. In line 6, for the *assim* of the MSS, *mussem* 'hint' would be at least better than *adsiem* of Wagner and Sabbadini. The grammarian's remark on line 12 may have been: *Parsimonia generis feminini; sed Virgilius parsimonia item pluraliter*, etc. (On the abbreviation of *pluraliter* see my 'Notae Latinae'.)

These be idle guesses. But (see Class. Quart. 1922, p. 106) the forthcoming edition of the *Liber Glossarum* will reveal to us readings of an earlier MS of the *Appendix* than any MS now extant.

W. M. LINDSAY.

THE UNIVERSITY,
ST. ANDREWS, SCOTLAND.

V.—THE ION OF EURIPIDES:

Emendations and Interpretations.

VERSE 286

A great deal of mental energy has been expended in an attempt to recover what the poet wrote instead of the second *τιμᾶ*, but of all the emendations (nearly a score) only one comes near to the original *in sense* (Kayser's *στυγῆθ'*) and this one, curiously enough, is farthest of all *in form* from the reading of the manuscripts; the others, from Scaliger's *τί μοι* to Bayfield's *τί μαίει*, are not only tame and undramatic, but also (most of them at least) wholly unsuited to the requirements of the context. When the youth asserts *τιμᾶ σφε Πύθιος*, Creusa exclaims, repeating Ion's *τιμᾶ* in a tone in which there is mingled sarcasm, scorn, indignation, and resentment, *τιμᾶ*—what? Certainly something that evokes the youth's surprised question: *τί δὲ στυγῆς σὺ τοῦ θεοῦ τὰ φίλτατα*; It was this question doubtless that suggested *στυγῆθ'* to Kayser. And he was on the right track in his search for the dislodged word. But certainly no scribe would misread *στυγῆθ'* and write *τιμᾶ*. The latter could get a lodgement in the text only through dittography, and while many of the mistakes in our MSS. are due to this phenomenon, we can hardly resort to such an explanation for the removal of a whole word.

I believe the corruption to be due to metathesis of letters, or of pronunciation: *TIMAIMATAI* became *TIMAITIMAI*. Certainly the thought expressed by *τιμᾶ μάται'* corresponds to Creusa's feeling in the matter, and uttered in the right tone by an actor would naturally arouse Ion's curiosity and evoke from him the query *τί δὲ στυγῆς*; for *μάταιον* means *τὸ πρὸς μηδὲν χρήσιμον*. Cf. *Soph. Tr.* 406 *εἰ μὴ κυρῶ λεύσσω μάταια*, 586 *εἴ τι μὴ δοκῶ πράσσειν μάταιον*.

VERSE 565

The MSS. read *οὐδὲν ἄρ' δυνάμεθα*. Wecklein adopts *Matthiae's* *ἄρ' ὀναίμεθ' ἄν*. But this cannot be right for many reasons. *Musgrave's*, *Wakefield's*, *Kayser's*, *Herwerden's*, *Schmidt's*, *Holzner's*, and *Stadtmüller's* emendations are also inadmissible.

The text is correct, with the exception of a single letter (ο

for ε) and the loss of the final ν after *δυναίμεθα*; and the mistake was due to incorrect division: *ουδοναρ* was misread *οὐδὲν ἄρ'* (Ion had just used *ἄρα* in his question). With this correction we not only secure a much more fitting and dramatic ending to Ion's pathetic outburst than the bald *οὐδὲν ἄρ' ὀναίμεθ' ἄν*, or *οὐδὲν ἀντωνήμεθα*, but there is also added a touch that is thoroughly Euripidean. The thoughts of the youth who has never known a mother's love, now revert, as he greets Xuthus with *χαῖρέ μοι, πάτερ*, to the other parent on whom he would lavish the tenderest affection, to his mother whom he has just beheld without knowing that it was his mother, and he asks in passionate entreaty *ὦ φίλη μήτηρ, πότ' ἄρα καὶ σὸν ὄψομαι δέμας*; He follows this up with *νῦν ποθῶ σε μᾶλλον ἢ πρὶν ἦτις εἰ ποτ' εἰσιδεῖν*. He craves now more than ever to see her beloved form; he desires to *see* her. But the thought crosses his mind that perhaps she is dead and that it will now be impossible for him to evoke her dear image even *in a dream*, *ἀλλ' ἴσως τέθνηκας, ἡμεῖς δ' οὐδ' ὄναρ δυναίμεθ' ἄν* (*sc. εἰσιδεῖν*). He answers his own question of *πότ' ἄρα καὶ σὸν ὄψομαι δέμας*, and that answer is not simply "Nevermore" but "Never." Cf. *Ar. Vesp.* 13 *ὄναρ εἶδον*, *Xen. Symp.* 4. 33, *Cyr.* 8. 7. 1.

The noun *ὄναρ* is here used adverbially, as often (= *κατ' ὄναρ*). Cf. *Aesch. Eum.* 116, 131 *ὄναρ διώκεις θῆρα*, *Eur. I. T.* 518 *μηδ' ἰδὼν ὄναρ*, *Cycl.* 8 *τοῦτ' ἰδὼν ὄναρ λέγω*, *Plut. Mor.* 183 A *ὄναρ ἰδὼν χρυσοῦν θέρος ἐξαμῶντα* (*cum in somnis vidisset*), *Eur. Fr.* 108 *οὐδ' ὄναρ κατ' εὐφρόνην | φίλοις ἔδειξεν αὐτόν*.

VERSE 692

The substantives *δόλον* and *τύχαν* cannot both be objects of *ἔχει*. The phrase *ἔχει δόλον* is merely a repetition of the thought in 686: *θέσφατα μή τιν' ἔχει δόλον*. Hence I should read:

*ἔχει δόλον · τάχ' ἦν ὁ παῖς
ἄλλων τραφεῖς ἐξ αἱμάτων.*

VERSE 702

I think the corruption is due to haplography. When *εσωσω* became *ἔσωσ(ε)*, *τύχης* (instead of *τύχης*) was inevitable. It is Creusa that is in the mind of the chorus, not her husband. The phrase *μέγαν ἐς ὄλβον*, in their attitude, in their feeling, is for Creusa: *ὡς τύχη(ς)*.

VERSE 737

Read τοὺς σοὺς παλαιοὺς ἐκ γένους αὐτόχθονος.

VERSE 847

Read εἰ γ' ἔργ' ὑφήσεις τοῦδ' ἀπαλλάξῃ βίον. The particle of emphasis (γε) comes after εἰ, not after γάρ. Owing to the frequency of the locution εἰ γάρ the words γ' ἔργ' were incorrectly divided, γερ being mistaken for γάρ. It is the *acts* of this man that no woman of the proper spirit should submit to.

VERSE 875

The MSS. read ἀπονισαμένη. Scholars have tried to restore the meaning with ἀπονιψαμένη (Scaliger) ἀπονησαμένη (Valckenaer), adopted by Wecklein, and ἀποσεισαμένη (Barnes), but without success. I suggest that ἀπονισαμένη was originally three words: ἀπό γ' ὤσαμένη.

VERSE 929

The text is sound; Beck's change of οὖς to οἷς and Musgrave's ἐκλαθοῦσα, Kirchhoff's ἐκκαλοῦσα, Reuscher's ἐκδραμοῦσα, ἐκπνέουσα, and Kayser's ἐκβαλοῦσ' ἐκ τῶν are wholly unnecessary. The relative οὖς is the direct object of μετῆλθες, and ὁδοῦς is cognate accusative. The participle ἐκβαλοῦσα (= ἐκβαίνουσα) is intransitive. Musgrave's καινὰς for κακάς in 930 is a certain correction. The best parallel to the passage is *Hipp.* 290-92 καὶ γνώμης ὁδὸν | ἔγωγ' ὅπη σοὶ μὴ καλῶς τόθ' εἰπόμην | μεθεῖσ' ἐπ' ἄλλον εἶμι βελτίω λόγον.

VERSE 1006

If a preposition were demanded, we might emend by making three words out of σώματος (σῶμά τ' ἐς), thus forming chiasmus with ἀμφὶ παιδί; but this is unnecessary. The old man asks: "in what did you *attach* (τὸ δὲ ἄπτειν καὶ δεῖν ταῦτόν ἐστιν) it to the body around the child?"

VERSE 1135

The language is highly poetic, the *essor* into the higher regions of fancy (1117-1158). Hence we must seek a poetic interpretation, and this is to be found in the acute Greek sense of personification, to which we must constantly return if we wish to fathom the meaning of Greek writers, particularly Greek poets.

I believe that *τελευτώσας βίον* is sound. "The rays that are ending their life" is only another way of saying "the rays of the dying sun (or day)." Scaliger changes *ἀκτίνας* to the genitive singular, evidently because *πρός* already has an object in *μέσας βολάς*. But the accusative plural, in my opinion, is what the poet wrote, and, if so, the whole verse should remain intact. The corruption is to be sought in the preceding word: *βολαῖς* was inadvertently (and naturally) changed to *βολάς* by reason of the preceding *πρός μέσας*. But this adjective modifies *ἀκτίνας*, not *βολάς*. Euripides desired to express the idea that Ion carefully guarded the guests from the sun of the late evening no less than from that of mid-day. But *μέσας ἀκτίνας* was not sufficiently explicit; the adjective required a qualifier, and so he added *βολαῖς* to designate in what respect they were *μέσας*. For *τελευτώσας βίον* compare Aesch. *Pers.* 232 ἄνακτος Ἡλίου φθινασμάτων, "où disparaît monseigneur le Soleil."

Kock's *μυσημβρινάς*, adopted by Wecklein, is not only too unlike the MS. reading *μέσας βολάς*, but it is also improbable for other reasons. The same may be said of Pierson's *βίαν* (for *βίον*), Musgrave's *ιδεῖν*, Hermann's *θεοῦ*, Seidler's *βάσιν*, Fix's *πάλιν*, Hartung's *βλέπων*, and Kock's *λίαν*. Cf. Ἡελίοιο βολαῖς · βολῇ ἐπὶ ἀκτίνων ἡλιακῶν, (Schol. Oppian. *Hal.* 3. 52), πέτρων βολαί (Eur. *Or.* 59), λίθων βολαί, βολαὶ ὀφθαλμῶν. Also *Ion* 1148 f. ἵππους μὲν ἦλαν' ἐς τελευταίαν φλόγα | Ἥλιος.

VERSE 1214

Wecklein adopts Musgrave's conjecture of *φάρμαχ'* for *πρέσβυν*, Reiske changes *ἔχονθ' ἔλοι* to *ἀλόντ' ἔχοι* (or *ἐλὼν θένοι*), Hartung to *κτείνονθ' ἔλοι*, Dindorf to *λαβὼν ἔχοι*. But the text is sound in toto. The meaning is: "to catch the old man red-handed," i. e. prove that he is guilty by finding the poison in his possession. Cf. 1211 (*σήμαινε*). The conjunction *ὥς* does double duty (as often): *ὥς* with *ἔλοι* (final) and *ὥς* with *ἔχοντα*.

VERSE 1253

The phrase *ἐκ γὰρ ἄκων* means nothing. Hence scholars have changed to *ἀρκύν γὰρ* (Wecklein), *οἰκων* (Victorius), *κακῶν* (Stephanus), *ἀτῶν* (Musgrave), *ἔρκων* (Jacobs), *ἐκ πετρῶν γὰρ* (Beck).

I am inclined to think that *γάρ* is an intruder (Creusa in her

excited state of mind disregards connectives) and is made up of two words γ' *αρ*, the latter being a part of ἀραχνῶν. This is much better than the tame οἰκων, κακῶν, or πετρῶν.

The verb προύλαβον seems to indicate that the effort made to extricate herself was more than a simple βαίνειν or ἔχειν πόδα. She had barely jumped out of the way of menacing death when she discovers that she has leaped into another and more perilous position. Cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 1492, 1516 κεῖσαι δ' ἀράχνης ἐν ὑφάσματι τῷδε, Anthol. Pal. II. 106. 6 καὶ τάχ' ἂν ἐρρολζητο δι' αἰθέρος, εἰ μὴ ἀράχνη | τοὺς πόδας ἐμπλεχθεὶς ὕπτιος ἐκρέματο. The word ἀράχνη means *araneae tela*.

VERSE 1288

One would hardly think that a score of emendations could be made to such a small number of words. No scholar has recognized that the first syllable of οὐσίαν is the negative. In the two conjectures already published by me I construed this negative with a following verb. I see now that it goes with the preceding sentence.

The altercation of Ion and Creusa would be amusing if translated into the colloquial language of children (for it seems almost childish to a modern):

Cr. You were no longer Apollo's; you were your father's.

Ion But I *was*, I tell you, I *wasn't* my father's—shut up, I say.

Cr. You were *not*—I am now—you're no longer his.

The excited boy feels so outraged by Creusa's declaration that he could no longer lay claim to Loxias, that he flatly denies the queen's assertion (ἐγενόμεσθα is the aorist of εἰμί, not of γίγνομαι) and then tells her to hold her tongue and refrain from such impious utterances (cf. 339): ἀλλ' ἐγενόμεσθα—πατρὸς δ' οὐ—σιγᾶν λέγω.

As in Soph. *O. T.* 1087 γ dropped out and σιαν merged with the preceding negative, forming the οὐσίαν of our MSS. Again in 1396 Ion bids Creusa hold her tongue (σίγα σύ). Cf. 666 σιγᾶν λέγω, Soph. *El.* 1458 σιγᾶν ἄνωγα, 1322 σιγᾶν ἐπήνεσ', σιγᾶν κελεύω, B 280 σιωπᾶν ἄνωγα, Eur. *Hec.* 530 σιγὴν κηρύξαι.

VERSE 1396

There are ten emendations recorded of the last two words; but all are made on the assumption that Ion is using a verb

in the second person singular (*ᾔσθα*, *ᾔδησθα*, *ὀχλοῦσα*, *ἐλοιδόρεις* etc.). I believe, on the other hand, that the youth is telling what his own experience has been, not what Creusa has done; and I should emend thus: *σίγα σύ · πολλὰ καὶ πάροιθεν ᾔσθόμην*.

The corruption is due to the influence of the first two words in the verse. After *σίγα σύ* the second person singular seemed natural and *ᾔσθο* was mistaken (by pronunciation?) for *οἶσθα*. This left *μην* in the air and a change to *μοι* was almost inevitable, especially if the last letter had dropped out, as in verse 565.

The sense of the verse now is just what the youth would be expected to say in his present mood: "Hold your tongue! I've already had enough from you!"

The verb *αἰσθάνομαι* means percipio auribus, ausculto, audio. Cf. *Or.* 1296 (with 1311), *Soph. Ai.* 1318 *ᾔσθόμην βοήν*, *Plato, Rep.* 6. 494 D, *Polit.* 306 D *εἶτε ἄλλον παρὰ ἐπαινοῦντος ᾔσθησθαι*.

VERSE 1427

Corruption attacked the extremities, *δρακωντις* becoming *δράκοντες* and *παγχρυσονεινν*, *παγχρύσω γένει*. Ion has just asked Creusa *ἔστιν τι πρὸς τῷδ'*, and the latter replies *δράκων τις* (which she describes as an *ἀρχαῖόν τι πάγχρυσον*) *ἐνῆν*, i. e. *ἐν τῷ ἄγγει* with him (Ion) when she exposed him (*ἄγγος οὐ' ἔέθηκ' ἐγὼ ποτε | σέ γ'* (1398). When the latter finally makes up his mind to test the truth of her statement, he asks: *κενὸν τόδ' ἄγγος ἢ στέγει πλήρωμά τι*; (1412), i. e. *ἔνεστί τι*; Moreover, after the youth has looked and verified her declaration, he uses the same verb that she had used, in confirmation of her assertion: *ἔνεισιν οἶδε* (1432). Further, *χρυσώματι* in 1430 seems to indicate that *ἀρχαῖόν τι πάγχρυσον* should be read in 1427.

VERSE 1608

The text gives just the opposite of the sense required: *καὶ πρὶν τοῦτο δ' οὐκ ἄπιστον ἦν*. What Ion evidently means is that this *was* incredible. I think the corruption is due to metathesis of letters: *κουδ* became *δουκ* (*δ'* is superfluous after *καὶ*), the original *γοιδ* (*γ' οἶδ'*) becoming the impossible *δ' ουκ* of our manuscripts. Hence I should read: *τοὔτό γ', οἶδ, ἄπιστον ἦν*.

J. E. HARRY.

VI.—NOTES ON HORACE'S SERMONES.

I.

1. 4. 9-10.

in hora saepe ducentos,
ut magnum, versus dictabat stans pede in uno.

The editors generally incline to interpret *stans pede in uno* as = *facillime*. See e. g. Gow, Rolfe, Palmer, Wickham, Kiessling (the original edition), Kirkland, and Morris. This view was adopted also by A. Otto, *Der Menschliche Körper und seine Teile im Sprichwort*, Archiv 6 (1889), 330.¹ For amusing misinterpretations see Fritzsche's commentary and Long's addition to Macleane's note.²

This view can not be right, for, if the words meant 'easily,' they would carry a compliment. But at this point Horace is condemning, not complimenting, Lucilius. In verses 1-8 (through *emunctae naris*) Horace has been complimentary to Lucilius, ascribing to him the plain-speaking of the writers of the Old Attic Comedy, their wit, and their discernment. In those verses Horace declares that Lucilius possessed, in the field of spirit, certain important qualifications essential to successful writing of satire—the discernment to see things about which a satirist might write or ought to write, and the courage and the wit to write of them frankly and effectively.

But in *durus componere versus*, 8, the tone changes, completely. Mention is now made of Lucilius's defects in the field

¹ Otto, *Die Sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer*, 275, s. v. *pes*, 4, interprets by "ohne jede Anstrengung, mit Leichtigkeit" (Leipzig, 1890).

² Schütz, who does not mention Quintilian, had the right idea about our passage, but his very brief comment seems to have attracted no attention. In 1910, and again in 1921, in the fourth and fifth versions of Kiessling's edition, Heinze wrote thus: "wohl volkstümlicher Ausdruck für 'lässlich': wer schwere körperliche Arbeit tut, muss fest auf beiden Beinen stehen. . . ." This note curiously mixes truth and error; pains, care, rather than difficulty, is the predominant idea in Horace's mind. Further, no proof or even illustration of the view is offered, beyond a reference to Quintilian 12. 9. 18.

of form. Verses 9-11 are needed; they explain and justify the stricture in *durus componere versus*, 8. Verses 9-10 emphasize the idea that Lucilius ran to excess, making quantity rather than quality his aim, or at least producing much without artistic quality or excellence. Verse 11 logically gives the result of the procedure set forth in 9-10; verses 12-13 explain why the facts were as they were. Horace had to defend,³ carefully and fully, any adverse comment he might make on Lucilius, because the latter had numerous and ardent admirers: witness Horace, *Sermones* 1. 10. 1-3, and the famous statement of Quintilian about the popularity of Lucilius even in his day (10. 1. 93).

Since, then, verses 9-11 are, throughout, condemnatory of Lucilius, *stans pede in uno* must mean something like 'carelessly,' 'negligently'; the carelessness would lie in the failure to bring into play all the powers he possessed and should have used. That Horace's contemporaries understood him better than modern editors have is clear from *Sermones* 1. 10. 1-3, 64-74.

Now, that *stans pede in uno* can mean 'carelessly' is plain from Quintilian 12. 9. 18 *Itaque in his actionibus omni, ut agricolae dicunt, pede standum est*. These words have been cited by many editors on our passage, and have, in fact, been, in and of themselves, rightly interpreted (e. g. by Wickham, and Heindorf-Wüstermann, as long ago as 1843: see Otto, as cited above). Yet their bearing on our passage has not, so far as I am aware, been fully seen. In quoting his farmers' saw, Quintilian meant 'we must bring into use our every resource,' 'we must employ every power we have.' There is no possibility of taking Quintilian to mean 'we must do it with difficulty.' That would be absurd in itself, in any context; it is impossible in this particular context. In the whole chapter Quintilian is discussing the way in which a pleader may prepare himself rightly for his pleading. In § 18 he very sensibly tells him, in effect, 'you must leave no stone unturned.' Com-

³ *Sermones* 1. 10 *passim* shows that in *Sermones* 1. 4. 9-18 Horace's defense of his strictures was not ample enough.—On the relation of Horace, *Sermones* 1. 4. and *Sermones* 1. 10, to each other, see my remarks in *American Journal of Philology* 33. 142-144.

pare also § 15: Adferet ad dicendum curae semper quantum plurimum poterit. See Spalding ad loc., and the sensible note in the Bohn translation.

Horace's meaning, then, is clear. He is condemning Lucilius. A man who has two legs has no justification for standing, repeatedly, on but one leg.

We may illustrate both Horace and Quintilian by citing certain words that occur in Petronius 39, as part of Trimalchio's lecture on the signs of the zodiac: In cancro ego natus sum. Ideo multis pedibus sto, et in mari et terra multa possideo, nam cancer et hoc et illoc quadrat. This means, plainly, that Trimalchio has many supports, many resources; he uses them all, he profits by them all. Compare also Terence, *Andria* 161-162 quem ego credo manibus pedibusque obnixe omnia facturum; 675-677 Ego, Pamphile, hoc tibi pro servitio debeo, conari manibus pedibusque noctesque et dies capitis periculum adire, dum prosim tibi; Cicero, *Tusc.* 2. 56 Quid? qui volunt exclamare maius, num satis habent latera, fauces, linguam intendere, e quibus eici vocem et fundi videmus? Toto corpore atque omnibus ungulis, ut dicitur, contentioni vocis adserviunt; Aen. 4. 252 hinc toto praeceps se corpore ad undas misit, said of Mercury's flight. See also Liddell and Scott, s. v. *πρός* 6 f.

II.

1. 4. 14.

Crispinus minimo me provocat

I wish to offer a suggestion concerning *minimo*. What would one expect Horace to say here? Something like 'Crispinus is willing to wager any amount of money that he can write more verses in a given time than I can.' In what he does say I see a very effective *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* joke: 'Crispinus is challenging me <to a duel of speed> in the sum of a—mite (farthing, nickel, centime, soldo)!' I grant that, to make such a joke most effectively, one ought to hold off his quip to the last possible moment; here *Crispinus me provocat—minimo!* would have been far more effective. I need not, however, stop to prove that often, in verse, both Greek and Latin, the word that makes the unexpected turn is not in fact postponed to the end. I shall cite only Horace, *Sermones* 1. 6. 130-131

His me consolor victurum suavius ac si
quaestor avus pater atque meus patruusque fuisset.

My explanation gives, it will be noted, precisely the view for which Bentley argued so strenuously, and gives it, too, without altering a letter of the traditional text.

III.

1. 4. 105-120.

This passage, too long to quote here, reminds me of Terence, *Adelphoe* 405-420, especially 414-418, and the parody of it by *Syros servos*, 425-431.⁴ Every one is aware that Horace knew Terence well; compare e. g. *Sermones* 2. 3. 260-271 with Terence, *Eunuchus* 46-63.

IV.

2. 3. 69-73.

scribe decem a Nerio—non est satis—adde *Cicutae*
nodosi tabulas centum, mille adde *catenas*:
effugiet tamen haec *sceleratus* vincula *Proteus*;
cum rapies in ius *malis* *ridentem alienis*,
fiet aper, modo *avis*, modo *saxum* et *cum* *volet arbor*.

This note is concerned primarily with the words *malis ridentem alienis*, 72. To get their sense we must have clearly in mind the thought of 65-73. If, says Horace, *Damasippus*, who got into debt and finally was ruined, is *stultus*, *insanus*, what of the creditor *Damasippi*? is he *sanus*?

There are two ways of lending money neither of which guarantees repayment of the loan: (1) the creditor may take no precautions whatever to get his money back; in fact he may go so far as to forbid the debtor to pay it back (65-68); (2) he

⁴This parallel was not noted by Palmer⁴ (1891), or by Morris (1909). It did appear in Kiessling-Heinze⁴ (1910). But, since even in Kiessling-Heinze (1910, 1921), there is no cross-reference, at *Sermones* 1. 4. 105-120 or at *Sermones* 2. 3. 260-271, either to Horace or to the other Terentian passage, I let my note stand as above. P. Fabia and Dziatzko-Kauer, in their editions of the *Adelphoe* (1892, 1903), and Fabia, in his *Eunuchus* (1895), noted the Horatian parallels. F. Plessis and Ashmore, in their editions of the *Adelphoe* (1884, 1893), did not.

may employ every conceivable precaution to get his money back. To make his point, Horace overstates his case. He would not, of course, have maintained that in actual fact no debtor ever paid his debts; but verse 71, interpreted *per se*, means precisely that every debtor is a *sceleratus Proteus*.

What of *malis ridentem alienis*? The comments of the editors on these words are, in my opinion, so vague and so wide of the mark that I do not stop to cite them. I believe that Horace inserted these words in advance of their logical place; they belong, logically, after *fiet aper, modo avis*, in the next verse.

Several things helped Horace to put the words where he did in fact put them. (1) They were suggested, naturally, by *Proteus* (71), and hence were in Horace's mind before he wrote a word of 72-73; (2) had he postponed them to 73, he would have been obliged to omit from that verse *modo saxum, et, cum volet, arbor*; (3) since the Romans did not use the comma, they would have had far less trouble than we in joining *malis ridentem alienis* to the words with which in logic, that is in common sense, they belong. We gain much through our use of commas, but we also at times lose through that use.

Verses 71-73 thus mean, simply: 'in spite of all, the debtor will slip out of these fastenings—he's a scoundrel, a veritable Proteus: when you hale him into court, he will turn himself into a boar, then into a bird, and grin at you with his borrowed jaws.'

CHARLES KNAPP.

BARNARD COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

VII.—VOSSIANUS Q 86 AND REGINENSIS 333.

In the *Philological Quarterly* I, 273, Professor Rand, discussing the *Codex Leidensis Vossianus Latinus* Q 86, writes: "What became of the Juvencus and the Sedulius at the beginning or the part of Isidore at the end we should much like to know. Perhaps some *scopritor felice* will come across them yet in Leyden or Paris or Rome." There can be no doubt, I think, that the Juvencus and Sedulius of this famous old Leyden codex are now in the Vatican Library in Rome, *Codex Reginensis* 333.¹

Dr. V. F. Büchner of the University of Leyden Library calculated from the signatures on the 26th and 31st quinions of the *Codex Vossianus* that just sixteen gatherings of ten leaves apiece, minus the leaf which now forms the first folio of the *Vossianus*, or 159 leaves in all, have been lost at the beginning (cf. Rand, art. cit., p. 266). *Codex Reginensis* 333 has these sixteen gatherings.² It comprises 163 leaves as now formed, but the first gathering is of twelve instead of ten leaves, the fourth gathering numbers eleven leaves because a single leaf has been inserted after fol. 43 in order to include fifty lines which had been omitted,³ and the present fol. 163 obviously does not belong to the first state of the book—indeed a remnant of the original fol. 163, cut when that folio became fol. 1 of the *Vossianus*, is visible.

¹ On the plain parchment binding are the old numbers 1129 and 1393. The latter is that of the catalog made in 1690 and that known to Montfaucon. On the manuscript itself, fol. 1r, is the number A. 37.

² The signatures of all the gatherings except the first and fifth are visible, but they are of two sorts: Arabic numerals at the beginning of each gathering and Roman at the end, both in the lower margin. The latter correspond to those in the *Vossianus* and undoubtedly belong to the original state of the book. They are found at the end of gatherings II, III, IV, VIII, XI, XIII, XIV, XV. It is a pleasure to record my indebtedness and gratitude to Dr. Büchner for the photographs of the *Vossianus* secured through him and for the information regarding it that he kindly sent me.

³ Cf. Marold's edition of Juvencus, p. 46, note to II, 543: "In V [= Reg. 333] hoc folium deerat (v. 543-591) et saec. XII suppletum est, legitur versus spurius post 544." Reifferscheid dates the hand of fol. 44 in the eleventh or twelfth century. Huemer does not date it.

The *Vossianus* opens with Arator's *Acts of the Apostles*, written in a fairly large and leisurely hand using, for the first 41 folios, single columns of sixteen lines to the page. The same hand, employing the same style and the same number of lines to the page, has written Juvenecus' *Evangeliorum libri IV* and Sedulius' *Paschale Carmen* in the *Reginensis*, and the size of the page in all three texts is the same.

Moreover, at the bottom of fol. 162^v of the *Reginensis* we find the greeting which regularly precedes Arator's *Acts of the Apostles* and the gloss *Incipit lib. Aratoris*. This greeting, which reads "Domino sacro scō beatissimo^a; atq: apostolico et in toto orbe primo omnium sacerdotum papae uigilio Arator subdiaconus,"⁴ has been supplied at the top of fol. 1 of the *Vossianus* in a later hand. It was apparently copied from the preceding page by the person who divided the original codex, for it contains the unusual *sacro* and *beatissimoque* which are not in the other manuscripts and omits the word *salutem* which is also wanting in the *Reginensis*.⁵ If further proof of the unity of the two codices were needed it exists in the marginal gloss beside the *Finitum est* of Sedulius' *Paschale Carmen* in the *Reginensis* (fol. 162^v): "Require in hoc volumine *Cantemus, socii, Domino, post Aratorem*." This refers to the hymn of Sedulius which is still in the *Vossianus*.⁶

Unfortunately the discovery of the relation of *Reginensis* 333 to the *Vossianus* does not settle the question of the date of the book. Indeed, although most authorities who have used the part now in Leyden date it in the ninth century, those who have edited Juvenecus and Sedulius from the part in the Vatican hesitate between the ninth and tenth. Arevalus, to be sure, in his edition of Juvenecus ascribed it "ad VIII aut IX saeculum,"

⁴The word *sacro* and the *q*; of *beatissimoq*; are in the hand that wrote the glosses.

⁵Cf. the preceding note and Migne LXVIII, col. 73, note, where, however, the words *atque apostolico* which occur in the *Vossianus* as well as in the *Reginensis* are omitted.

⁶For a summary of the contents of the *Vossianus*, see Peiper's edition of Avitus, p. lxvi. Immediately following Arator (fol. 1-63) are the epigrams of Prosper (63^v-79^r). The hymn of Sedulius follows them (79^v).

but Reifferscheid⁷ calls it tenth century and his date was accepted by Huemer in his edition of Sedulius made in 1885.⁸ Marold, who edited Juvenius in 1886, did not decide between the dates of Arevalus and Reifferscheid though he stated that Lud. Jeep, who collated the manuscript for him, agreed with Arevalus. Finally, Huemer in his edition of Juvenius (1891) calls the manuscript *saec. IX vel X*.

That the book (or its twin, as Professor Rand would prefer) was in Cluny in the twelfth century, the catalog first cited by Peiper in this connection would indicate (cf. Rand, art. cit., p. 261). The finding of the lost Juvenius and Sedulius completes the identification of our book with the volume described in the Cluny catalog. According to Professor Rand, however, the *Vossianus* probably was written at Fleury. He assumes that it was either brought to Cluny, or that the book described in the Cluny catalog is the twin of our codex. His argument is based not only on a feeling that the script of the *Vossianus* resembles the hand in vogue at Fleury in the latter half of the ninth century, but on the assumption that a copy of Phaedrus conserved in the Vatican, *Codex Reginensis* 1616, which is a book of Fleury, originally belonged to our volume. Whether or not the handwriting of the *Vossianus* is that of Fleury, I do not feel competent to judge, but I find it difficult to believe that the copy of Phaedrus in *Reginensis* 1616 ever formed part (necessarily the last part) of the *Vossianus*. Waiving the point that the last item in the Cluny catalog's description of the manuscript is "*ars Isidori de grammatica et de disciplinis aliarum artium*" (a fragment of which concludes the *Vossianus*) and that there is no mention of Phaedrus' fables, I think the difference in the size of the pages and in that of the space occupied by the script in these two codices precludes the possibility that they were ever united. The Phaedrus page (0.19 x 0.12) is appre-

⁷ Sitzungsberichte, K. Akademie d. Wiss., Phil.-Hist. Classe, Wien, vol. 59 (1868), p. 110.

⁸ Huemer, not suspecting the unity of the two books, followed Reifferscheid in ascribing the copy of Sedulius' *Paschale Carmen* that he found in *Reg.* 333 to the tenth century (p. xx); following Peiper, he dated the transcription of the hymn that he found in the *Vossianus* to the ninth (p. 155, note).

ciably smaller than that of the *Vossianus* (0.23×0.18) and its margins show that it could not have been cut down from a page as large as the latter.⁹ The left-hand margins of recto and verso are of approximately the same width, and there has been no cutting where the two sheets that make up the binion are folded.

If, however, our manuscript dates from the ninth century, it could hardly have been written at Cluny which was founded in 910. Can it be dated with certainty in the ninth century? The script of Cluny according to Thompson (*Introduction to Greek and Latin Paleography*, p. 418) tended to be conservative, and, as we have seen, the hand of *Reginensis* 333 has been dated from the tenth as well as from the ninth century. Brave is the paleographer, however, who would distinguish between a late ninth and an early tenth century manuscript with only the script to aid him. The problem of the date and provenience of our codex, therefore, still awaits a satisfactory solution. The purpose of this paper is merely to show that the Juvenius and Sedulius of *Reginensis* 333 quite surely preceded the works contained in *Vossianus* Q 86.¹⁰

GRACE FRANK.

THE AMERICAN ACADEMY IN ROME.

⁹ Cf. the reproductions and measurements in Chatelain, *Paléographie des Classiques latins*, II, plates CLII and CLXV. I should give the average measurements of *Reg.* 333 as 0.235×0.185 and of the *Phaedrus* page as 0.193×0.12 .

¹⁰ After this paper had left my hands I was fortunate enough to meet Mgr. Stanislas Le Grelle who is preparing a monumental work on the *Reginensis*. He kindly supplied me with material proof of the foregoing. According to Mgr. Le Grelle, the original codex before the division was numbered A 37 by Paul Petau (cf. note 1 above), 903 by Alexandre Petau. Under the latter the separation occurred, the Roman half receiving the number 1129, later becoming *Reg.* 1393 (Montfaucon's number) and finally *Reg.* 333, the Leyden half being numbered 1157 and later becoming *Voss.* Q 86. The *Phaedrus* of *Reg.* 1616, on the other hand, was numbered Q 23 in Paul Petau's library, 1029 and 1631 in Alexandre Petau's, and 839 in the early *Reginensis* catalog (Montfaucon's number).

VIII.—DRAVIDIAN Z.

Initial *sn* became *n* in Kanara and Tamil, *sN* (with voiceless *n*) in Telugu, Tulu and northern Dravidian. Brâhui develop *h* < *hN* < *sN*, Gôndi *h* < *s* < *sN*, Kui *s* < *sN*; *N* was changed to *t*, and the *s* was lost, in Kurukh, Malto, Telugu and Tulu.¹ The present position of Tulu is near a branch of the Kistna river-system, which in its lower course flows eastward thru Telugu territory. If we assume for Tulu a former position in what is now the Telugu region, we get a clear geographic arrangement in the derivatives of *sn*: northwestern *h*; central or more strictly north-central *s* (later *h* in Gôndi); eastern *st*, afterward *t*; southwestern *n*.

An equally clear geographic distribution appears in the derivatives of *zn*: northwestern *d* (Brâhui); central *s* (kept in Kui, changed to *h* in Gôndi); northeastern *t* (Kurukh-Malto); southern *n* (Kanara, Tamil, Telugu, Tulu). As the nasal element of *sn* and *zn* is found only in southern Dravidian, we should probably assume that *zn* made *zd* in Brâhui and Kurukh-Malto. This would give northern, central, southern, as the main divisions in the treatment of *zn*. We might however assume *sn* < *zn* for Kurukh-Malto, and leave Brâhui *zd* isolated. If it is true that the entire western coast of India is largely Dravidian in ethnology, it is evidently possible that the great geographic separation of Brâhui from its relatives corresponds to a similar linguistic separation.

In the fourth volume of the Linguistic Survey of India, the Dravidian word-list gives for 'mouth' Brâhui *bā*, Gôndi *tuḍḍi*, Kui *sudā*, Kurukh *bai*, Malto *toro*, Kanara *bāji*, Tamil *vāji*, Telugu *nōru*, and for 'nose' Brâhui *bāmus*, Gôndi *mussōr*, Kui *mungēli*, Kurukh *mūi*, Malto *muso*, Kanara *mūgu*, Tamil *mūkku*, Telugu *mukku*. The Tulu words are *bāji* and *mūku*. Brâhui *bāmus* is a compound of *bā* and **muso* = Malto *muso*; these words illustrate the retention of ancient medial *s* in the extreme north.² Likewise Gôndi *mussōr* is composed of **muso* and **soro* or **zoro*, the equivalent of Malto *toro*, Telugu *nōru* <

¹ American Journal of Philology, vol. 40, p. 84.

² American Journal of Philology, vol. 40, p. 83.

**znoro*. Gôndi normally develop *h* from *zn*, as from *sn* and simple *s*; but the loss of weak vowels produced *ss* in *mussôr*. Gôndi *s* comes ordinarily from the palatal occlusive *c*.³ The word *tuḍḍi* is evidently different from **znoro*, and connected with southern words for 'lip': Kanara *tuṭi*, Tulu *duḍi*. Kui *sudā* apparently has *s* < *zn*; the change of **soro* to *sudā* may have come from a **tud*-synonym corresponding to Gôndi *tuḍḍi*.

Aside from Aryan loan-words used in Kurukh and Malto, the Dravidian words for 'water' seem to have the basis **zniro*, perhaps with the variant **znairo*: Brâhui *ḍir*, Gôndi *jēr*, Kui *sirō*, southern *nīr* and *nīru* (replaced by the plural *nīllu* in modern Telugu). In Gôndi, as in southern Dravidian, initial *j* is commonly added before palatal vowels; and *jēr* is the similarly altered form of a word that would otherwise have initial *h*.

Other words that seem to imply early *zn*-forms are Brâhui *daṛ* = Tamil *naṛuv*- (descend), Brâhui *ḍitar* = Kanara *nettar* (blood), Brâhui *dui* = Tamil *nāvu* (tongue). A root **znaw* would explain *dui* and *nāvu*; a variant **znalg* is apparently needed for 'tongue' in several languages: Kurukh *tatrā* (*tx* < *lk*), Kanara *nālige*, Telugu *nāluka*, Tulu *nālaji* (with the ending of *bāji*). Perhaps **znalg* came from **znaw* thru **znag* and **znang*, with extension of nasality followed by dissimilation, as in Rumanian *mărunț* < **menunto* < *minūtus*.

EDWIN H. TUTTLE.

NORTH HAVEN, CONN.

³American Journal of Philology, vol. 40, p. 82.

REPORTS.

HERMES LVI (1921).

Das Prooemium des Lucretius (1-65). F. Jacoby considers Lucretius' introduction to his poem I, 1-145 one of the most magnificent creations of Roman literature, and worthy to stand alongside the best that Greek genius has produced; hence the numerous attempts to throw light upon it have been justified, whether scholars, like Lachmann, find a lack of sequence in the traditional order, or, like Vahlen, try to justify their conservatism. The greatest difficulty has been an apparent dualism, which has suggested the idea of two separate introductions. Even conservatives have failed to give a satisfactory explanation. Jacoby thinks the solution is that Lucretius has interwoven the dedication to Memmius with a eulogy of the subject-matter, which involves the praise of Epicurus. The whole may be resolved into sections, which, while they cohere logically, follow one another with more or less abruptness, which must be recognized as characteristic of Lucretius' style. He summarizes his results in the following scheme:

1-43	Gebet an Venus, die Patronin des Memmius	M I—	
40-53	Beginn der Widmung an Memmius	M II a—	
54-61	Beginn der Propositio des Werkes	M II b—	
62-79	ἔπαινος Ἐπικούρου	E I—	
80-101	Verteidigung der Lehre gegen den Vorwurf der <i>impietas</i>	E II—	C B A
102-126	Verteidigung gegen die <i>dicta vatium</i>	E III a—	
127-135	Schluss der Propositio des Werkes	M II b = E III b—	
136-145	Schluss der Widmung an Memmius	M III—	

This scheme is rooted in antique literary traditions; but is nevertheless unique. J. contrasts it with Vergil's introduction to his Georgics. An elaborate argument (pp. 51-65) tries to show that v. 50 follows v. 43 without a break.

Metrische Beiträge (66-103). K. Münscher continues his metrical studies (see A. J. P. XLI, p. 89) under the following heads: Erstarrte Formen im Versbau der Aiolier. 1. Das Glykoneion als Versbildner, 2. Das Anakreonteion als Versbildner, 3. Enhoplios, Telesilleion, Reizianum als Versbildner, and 4. Die alkaische Strophe. In the last section he argues that Horace followed his own free artistic feeling when he normalized the Greek verses; but his feeling was that of a 'formstrenger' Roman, and so he narrowed the freer form of the Greeks.

Miscellen: W. Otto (104-106) supplements his note on the χρηματιστικὸς πυλῶν (A. J. P. XLII 347-8) with citations: II Sam. 19, 9 etc., to show the practice of holding audiences in the 'gate' of private houses as well as in the city gate or gate of the palace. The oriental king was originally more accessible to his subjects than later.—K. Praechter rejects Usener's emendation (Epicurea p. 367, 10 ff.): ὅστατον εἶπε <τοῦπος> ἀποφθίμενος for the MS. πρῶτος. Although Epicurus was not the first of the circle of friends to die, Diogenes Laertius (X 16), who was fond of forced antitheses, probably used πρῶτος (MSS. B and F), if not πρῶτον.—K. Praechter (108-112) regards Lucretius V 168-173, 175, 176, as an addition promised in v. 155, which however was never finally adjusted by the author. Cicero de nat. deor. I 9, 22 f. obtained the same idea from an Epicurean source. Eliminating the above verses, we have a consistent passage with 165-167, 174, 177-180. The above is a minor addition within the larger expansion V 110-234. P. refers to Merrill's edition p. 663 for the literature dealing with the above passage.

Die Varronischen di certi und incerti (113-130). G. Wissowa defends his view that Varro (Antiquit. rerum div. xiv-xvi) classified the gods with respect to the certainty he felt as to their nature and activities; hence book XIV is entitled de diis certis, book XV de diis incertis, he himself says of the latter (fgm. 1 Aug. de civ. dei VII 17) "cum in hoc libello dubias de diis opiniones posuero, reprehendi non debeo." Book XVI (de diis praecipuis atque selectis) did not contain a third group, but a selected number from XIV and XV, which Varro discusses from a different standpoint. Many have sought a deeper meaning in Varro's terms. E. Bickel in his book "Der altrömische Gottesbegriff" tries to show that the above three books de diis deal respectively with δαίμονες, ἥρωες and θεοί. Wissowa refutes this in detail.

Scipio Africanus und die Eroberung von Neukarthago (131-225). R. Laqueur subjects Polybius' book X to a minute analysis which, he thinks, substantiates the results of a former analysis of book III, on which he based his theory set forth in his book 'Polybius.' Polybius, he thinks, began his history on a small scale and in the spirit of the Hellenistic historiography in which the ἐκπλήττειν was designed to please his readers. But as Polybius, citizen of a small Greek town, gradually had his views enlarged in Rome, where he became familiar with the Roman government and military organization (especially fruitful was his association with the younger Scipio at Carthage), and after, at a still later date, he came under the influence of the Stoic philosopher Panaetius, he changed his conceptions of historic writing and enlarged the plan of his history. In fact,

in accordance with his gradually expanding knowledge, he subjected his history to a number of later revisions, which produced a number of incongruities. The most important revision was the last, which resulted in a world's history, in which the rationalism derived from Panaetius dominated his exposition. Logical clearness was gained at the expense of pure history. This development must be taken into consideration when Polybius is used as a source. The analysis of book X makes plausible the existence of different strata of information; that derived from Laelius is more valuable than Ed. Meyer thinks (cf. Berl. Sitzb. 1916 pp. 1068 ff.).

Miscellen: K. Praechter (226-227) emends a passage in Porphyrius in Aristot. Categ. Comm. P. 123, 29 ff., where a confusion in the change of interlocutors escaped the notice of Busse (Commentaria in Arist. Graeca IV 1).—F. Bechtel (228) explains the name of Poseidon's son Ἀλθηπος (Paus. II 30, 5) by identifying -πος with -φος (cf. Τήλεφος). The π is due to the tendency to dissimilate, as in ἐχέτλη, φύτλα and χύτλον. Ἀλθη- has been connected with ἄλθα' θεραπεία (Hesych.), but should be identified with the Homeric ἀλθήσθαι.

Zur Beurteilung der politischen Wirksamkeit des Tiberius und Gaius Gracchus (229-301). E. von Stern calls attention to the opposing views in the extensive ancient literature that deals with the Gracchi, as well as to the conflict of opinion among modern scholars. Ed. Schwartz (Gött. Gel. Anzeigen 1896, 792-811) characterizes Tib. Gr. as Socialrevolutionär, on the other hand R. von Pöhlmann (Aus Altertum und Gegenwart N. F. 1911, 122) as Socialreformer. Stern threads his way through the conflicting sources and their modern interpreters and reaches the conclusion that Tiberius Gracchus began his tribuneship with a carefully prepared plan of a moderate agrarian reform, with which an influential group of senatorial optimates sympathized; but owing to opposition he became in the end a social revolutionary. He was guilty of three illegal acts: the abrogatio of the tribune Octavius; the proposal to place the Pergamene inheritance in the hands of the people, thus infringing the rights of the senate; and thirdly his attempt to secure the tribuneship for the succeeding year. Tib. Gr. tried to introduce the Greek ideal of the sovereignty of the people, which was foreign to the traditional Roman conception of government. He was a well-meaning idealist, not a real statesman, and not a predecessor of Caesar. To estimate the political activities of the more talented C. Gracchus it is important to determine the chronological sequence of his various measures of reform. On this basis Stern shows how wisely he drew the various elements of the people to his support. This was accomplished during his

first tribuneship. But the senatorial party began popular legislation in its turn. The result was that, in his second tribuneship (122 B. C.), his influence waned. His great plan of enfranchising the Latins and Italians, which he had already mentioned in his speech *de legibus promulgatis* (123 B. C.), was rejected when it was finally put to vote in 122 B. C. When his opponents undertook to repeal his *lex de colonia Carthag.-Junonia* he and his friends succeeded in postponing the vote on this measure; but not without violence. Antullus, one of the senatorial party was slain. This gave the consul Opimius, clothed with a *senatus consultum ultimum*, the opportunity to assemble a military force. C. Gracchus and his followers fortified themselves on the Aventine. The outcome was the complete overthrow of C. Gracchus and his followers. Like his brother Tiberius, C. Gracchus was guided by ideal visions of the sovereignty of the Greek polis, and failed to realize the strength of Roman traditions. He, like his brother, ended as a revolutionary. The article brings out impressively the political conflicts that raged during their careers.

Zu Euripides' Troerinnen (302-313). C. Robert emends and interprets Eur. Troades: vv. 308 f.; 547 f.; 847 f.

Zum Freiburger Makedonierdialog (314-319. L. Deubner emends the two papyri of the second century A. D., published by W. Aly in Heidelberg. Sitzungs. 1914 Abh. 2, and explains the two handwritings as due to dictation from a single MS, which contained a dialogue, where two minor characters open a scene, which introduces Antipatros as the principal character. Such an introduction is especially common in ancient comedies. The end of the second fragment announces the appearance of Olympias. Aly calls attention to the resemblance to the dialogues of Lucian, and Deubner now relates it to Lucian's *Ἐγκώμιον Δημοσθένους* §§ 26, 29, where a reference to just such a Macedonian dialogue of Antipatros is mentioned.

Sparta und Persien in der Pentekontaetie (320-325). U. Kahrstedt makes an argument to show that Pausanias had concluded a peace with Persia for Sparta and allies some twenty-five years before the peace of Kallias in 448 B. C. The Spartan peace must have guaranteed the independence of the Asiatic Greeks in some form, hence the peace of the Athenian Kallias was nothing to be proud of.

Blutgerichte 'Εν Ὑπαίθρῳ (326-331). O. Weinreich explains the Attic practice: *ἀπαντα τὰ δικαστήρια ἐν ὑπαίθρῳ δικάζει τὰς δίκας τοῦ φόνον* (Antiphon π. τ. Ἡρώδου φόνον 11) as due to the belief that Helios and Zeus Hyetios could cleanse the *μίασμα* caused by a death. This is the probable reason why the roof of a death-

polluted building was removed. W. cites the temple chronicle of Lindos (Blinkenberg, *Kl. Texte* 131, Bonn 1915), Herodotus III 125, and Thucydides 1, 134, all of which he discusses, and cites inter alia Sartori: *Das Dach im Volksglauben*, *Zeitschr. d. Ver. f. Volksk.* XXV 1915, 231 f.

Miscellen: W. Spiegelberg (332-333) shows that of the three Greek forms *ψάγδαν*, *ψάγδας* and *σάγδας*, which designate a certain Egyptian salve, the first corresponds closest to the reconstructed **psāgdan*;—the other two are due to Greek influence.—O. Weinreich (333-334) cites as an example of "one more for good measure" in mythology (cf. *Arch. f. Rel.-Wiss.* X 1907, p. 89 f.; XVIII 1915, p. 603) Apuleius *metam.* VI 8, where, beside the septem savia suavia, Venus is to give et unum blandientis adpulsu linguae longe mellitum. That this passage is a Roman adaptation of Moschos' *Ἔρως δραπέτης* has been pointed out by Crusius: *Unters. zu Herondas* 145^{xxx}; Dietze, *Philol.* LIX 1900 p. 143 etc.—K. Praechter (334-335) adds to Philippson's restorations of Philodemus' *περὶ ὀργῆς* Fr. E. (P. 4 Wilke) *τὴν γῆ[ν τῇ βακτηρίαι] τύπτει* and cites as parallels Aesch. Ag. 202 f., Iliad A 245 (cf. *Rh. Mus.* LXXI 1916 p. 427 ff.)—F. Bechtel (335) explains the names of two Thessalian rivers (*IG.* IX 2 p. xi n. 205 11) *Κερκινεύς* and *Βουλεύς*. The form *Κερκίνος* is an ablaut of *καρκίνος*, and as *-εύς* may express fulness, the first name indicates an abundance of crabs. The second name suggests the mud during a freshet, when there was an abundance of *βῶλος* (Thessalian *ου = ω*).—G. Wissowa (p. 336) makes some apologies to E. Bickel, without, however, modifying his view concerning Varro's *di certi* etc. (see above).

Zu Tibull. I 1, 11-24 (337-345). O. Weinreich agrees with Reitzenstein's rejection of Jacoby's theory that vv. 11 ff. in the first elegy of Tibullus depend on Propertius I 4, 23 f. (cf. *A. J. P.* XXXVII, 360), and shows that there is absolutely no verbal agreement. The abruptness of Propertius' introduction of fetish worship could more naturally suggest this poet's dependence on Tibullus. That Ovid *Fast.* II 641 ff. was influenced by Tibullus is clear; Tibullus: *seu-seu, stipes-lapis, floridaserta, desertus in agris* (verse end); Ovid: *sive-sive, lapis-stipes, binaque sarta, defossus in agro* (verse end). Ovid's dependence on Tibullus is well known. The *τόπος* of the worship of stocks and stones occurs so frequently in Classic and Christian literature that it offers no criterion of literary dependence.

Der neue Tyrtaios (346-354). A. Gercke emends the Tyrtaios fragments published by Wilamowitz (*SB der Berl. Ak.* 1918, 728 ff.). The mention of the old Dorian tribes in v. 12 (*χωρίς Πάμφυλοί τε καὶ Ὑλλεῖς ἡδ[ὲ] Δυμῶνες*) supports the otherwise probable genuineness of these fragments. Crudities of style sug-

gest hasty composition for a special occasion. The connected fgmts., vv. 6-24, describe a battle with epic comparisons. The Spartans are on the defensive, but look forward to ultimate victory. On the other hand the fragmentary words, vv. 61 to 73, indicate an assault on a walled town, probably Eira. Μεσσηνίων occurs in v. 66. Especially interesting is a comparison drawn from chariot races (vv. 32-40), which Gercke associates with the tradition that chariot races were introduced at Olympia 680 B. C., and suggests the possibility of Hippias depending on Tyrtaeus for his date.

Zu Philodems Schrift über die Frömmigkeit (355-410). R. Philippon discusses the rest of the considerable fragments of Phil. *περὶ εὐσεβείας* (book II): pap. 1098, 1610, 229, 437, 1788, 452. He shows that pap. 1077 gives a briefer account of the same subject. The contents defend the Epicureans against charges of impiety, and assert the genuineness of their belief in the existence of the gods, which is not incompatible with their physical theories. One passage speaks of Polyaeus' citing man's inventions as proof of his intelligence.

Literarhistorische Beiträge. VI. Zu den unter Suetons Namen überlieferten verborum differentiae (411-421). W. A. Baehrens concludes from a comparison of the list of synonyms in cod. Montepessul. H 306 s. IX, fol. 61^r-68^r with other largely identical lists, which omit Suetonius' name, that Suet. name is a forgery. The same MS incorrectly ascribes other lists of differentiae resp. to Valerius Probus and Cicero. These names were all introduced to attract readers. That Suetonius occasionally remarked on differentiae was known (cf. Serv. ad Aen. XII 185).

Der fünfte Anacharsisbrief (422-431). K. Praechter presents two versions of this imaginary letter, together with Cicero's translation (Tusc. V, 90). It combines traditional views of Scythian and other primitive modes of life with the Socratic-Cynic-Stoic simple life. Praechter discusses this form of literature, and admits the possibility of some of the supposed Cynic characteristics being older than the Cynic philosophy (cf. Festgabe Hugo Blümner, Zürich 1914, pp. 425-433).

Miscellen: †Th. Thalheim (432-434) would place in (Dem.) L 14: καὶ ὑπὸ πολλῶν αὐτῷ λόγῳ ἐξηπατημένοι after προλαβόντες; in (Dem.) LIX 22 he considers ἀωροτέρα for the corrupt νεωτέρα better than Blass's ἀφανεστέρα; farther on (33/4) Blass deleted τράπεζαν παραθέμενοι, but Th. thinks the διάκονοι used the table as a screen; in the testimony (34) read <παρὰ> Νεαίρας; in the πρόκλησις (124), Voemel, with general approval, introduced οὐκ: περὶ τῶν παίδων τῶν ὄντων Νεαίρα ὅτι <οὐκ> ἐκ Στεφάνου εἰσί, but

this destroys the point at issue. Apollodorus changed his standpoint (cf. 38 and 51) in order to catch Stephanus in a trap.—W. Spiegelberg (434-438) calls attention to Herodotus' omission in II 36 of the hieratic script as a third form of writing. Herod. probably obtained his information from some Greek dragoman. An intelligent Egyptian would have called the demotic script "Briefschrift," and τὰ ἱρὰ (γράμματα) "Schrift der Gottes-Worte" or "Schrift des Lebenshauses." He emends Hdt. II 36: αὐτοὶ μὲν φασι ἐπιδέξια ποιεῖν, "Ἕλληνας δὲ ἐπαρίστερα, and cites proof for the meaning "in the right way"—"in the wrong way."—W. Morel (438-439) adds posui to bene merenti, which is Bees' reading of a Latin inscription in Greek letters: ΕΙΒΕΝΕ . ΕΡΕΤΕΙΠΟΕΥΕΙ found on a tombstone: no 163, published in "Die Insch. der jüdisch. Katakombe am Monteverde zu Rom" (Leipzig 1919), and corrects a stone cutter's error in no. 122: ἐξῆσεν ἔτη δέκα ἰσα ιζ, by recognizing in ΙCΑ ΙΖ, ΚΑΙ Ζ. —O. Wagner (439-441) emends Nepos Atticus 3, 2: itaque aliquot < ipsius effigies > locis sanctissimis posuerunt and cites effigiem in Cic. in Ver. II 2 159. —K. Praechter (441-443) emends Julian Or. 6 p. 238, 3 ff. (Hertlein): τὰ τε γὰρ θεῖα διὰ τῆς ἐνούσης ἡμῖν θείας μέριδος, τὰ τε θνητὰ διὰ τῆς θνητοειδοῦς μοίρας < καὶ > πρὸς τούτοις < σαφῆ > τὰ μεταξύ < τῷ > ζῶν εἶναι τὸν ἄνθρωπον κτλ. He emphasizes the importance of τὰ μεταξύ: man is the syndesmos between god and beast. Julian repeats in this passage a thought often recurring since Plato's Symposium: "the individual dies, the type survives."—W. A. Baehrens (443-445) objects to Harnack's identification of Pacatus, the author of an attack on Porphyrius, with the rhetorician Drepanius Pacatus, author of Panegyricus II (XII), as the fragments of the former reveal an inferior Latin. Nor is Harnack right in identifying the orator Pacatus who eulogizes Theodosius 389 A. D. with the Pacatus whom Ursanius asked 431 A. D. to write a poem in praise of Paulinus Nolanus (Migne LIII p. 59 f.).—L. Deubner (445) changes ὑπέρχεται to ἐπέρχεται in the Freiburger pap. II 6, reported above.

HERMAN L. EBELING.

GOUCHER COLLEGE.

PHILOLOGUS LXXVII (N. F. XXXI) 1921.

Pp. 1-25. E. Maass, Die Erigone des Sophokles. A critical examination of the eight sources dealing with the myth; the myth itself; and the content and fragments of Sophokles' drama. According to one tradition Erigone was the daughter of an Attic father, Ikarios, on whom Dionysos bestowed the vine. When some shepherds became drunk and their kinsmen slew

Ikarios, Erigone hanged herself. Thereupon followed blight and pestilence, which ceased only when a cult of the souls of the dead was consecrated to Erigone at the Anthesteria in March. A second account makes her the daughter of the Lakonian Aigisthos and his avenger as the accuser of Orestes. Rejected by the Areopagos she died of grief. There is also a reminiscence of this myth in the Anthesteria. Again, at the Aiorai, a rite of the Anthesteria, she is called the daughter of Maleotes or Maleos, a Tyrrhenian pirate. Masks on boards were hung on trees as offerings to her, a survival of human sacrifice, but in popular belief were connected with the gift of strength and fertility associated with the daimon of spring. The name Erigone suggests 'birth in the early morning'; she is like Lucia or Mania, but a mortal. Fragments 214, 215 N² are certainly from the Erigone; perhaps, also, fr. inc. 706, 867. The satyric drama dealt with the capture of Dionysos by a pirate-ship, a seafight, the death of the captain, and the honors paid to him. 'Maleotes' seems to have been the morning wind from the sea. 'Theoris' is taken to be the name, not of Sophokles' hetaira, but of the pirate ship. Fr. 698 was probably spoken by a chorus of satyrs (cf. Eur. Kykl. 11 ff.). The Erigone was a satyric play, a dramatized legend of the Anthesteria, but not composed for that festival. Dionysos came into Attica as a god of spring and the rites are to be judged accordingly. From Hesychios s. v. εὐδείπνους the following may be reconstructed: ἡ τριτογενὴς ἐπιφερομένης νεκροῖσιν εὐδείπνους χοῶς | ἦγεν πνοή. The passage does not belong to the Erigone, but the author is probably Archilochus.

Pp. 26-45. E. Wuest, Skolion und Γεφυρισμός in der alten Komödie. The attempt is here made to consider the broader relations of the short lyric passages inserted in the old Greek comedy after the parabasis and to show that the poet in arranging them adhered to a tradition already fixed and obligatory at the time when the old comedy flourished. (1) The scene in the Ecclesiazousae which contains two skolia (vss. 938-945) stands exactly in the middle of the so-called burlesque scenes (vss. 700-1181) following the agon. Such cases are found in Acharn. 929-951; Kts. 973-996; Peace 836-867, 909-921; Birds 1372-1376, 1410-1415; Lys. 1043-1058 = 1059-1072 = 1188-1204 = 1205-1215; Thesm. 953-1000; Frogs 814-817 = 818-821 = 822-825 = 826-829; 1251-1253 = 1254-1256. Eccl. 938-945, 900-905 = 906-911, 912-917 = 916-925, 952-959 = 960-968; 969-972 = 973-976. The Clouds and the Plutus have no similar passages. In the Wasps, vss. 1226, 1232, 1238, 1245 contain a conversation about skolia, introducing the beginnings of four skolia. All these scenes contain short lyrics having close connection with the comic action and meters resembling

those of extant skolia. Such lyrics also occur in the comic fragments and were used in tragedy (cf. Frogs 1302). (2) Five cases occur of λόγοι Αἰσωπικοὶ γέλοιοι in the form of skolia. (3) Most of the plays of Aristophanes contain lyrics of about ten verses which are of the nature of lampoons and, like the parabasis, are independent of the action: Ach. 1150-1161 = 1162-1173; Kts. 1111-1150; Wasps 1265-1291; Peace 775-817; Birds 1470-1493, 1553-1564, 1694-1705; Lys. 785-796 = 809-820; Frogs 416-433. In Eccl. 1111-1112 and Plut. after 958 or 1170 there are χοροῦ gaps. These lampoons may possibly be echoes of the γεφυρισμοί, the scurrilities hurled at pilgrims on their way to Eleusis.

Pp. 46-76. O. Lautensach, Grammatische Studien zu den attischen Tragikern und Komikern: Infinitiv und Partizipien. A critical study of the forms of infinitives and participles arranged according to the several categories of inflection. Many conjectural emendations are rejected as not conforming to the usage. (Concluded pp. 228-255.)

Pp. 77-108. L. Weber, ΣΥΚΑ 'ΕΦ 'ΕΡΜΗΙ. Part IV. (Conclusion.) See Philologus LXXIV 92 ff., 248 ff., LXXVI 60 ff. The earlier form of the epigram in the 'notorious' passage, Herod. V 77, is found in I. G. I. Suppl. p. 78. It indicates that the old monument, erected shortly after 507 B. C. and destroyed in the Persian invasion, was repaired; for Herodotos refers to the newer votive offering and quotes the later form of the epigram. The site of the monument was never changed. The text of Herodotos should omit τὰ after προπύλαια; the quadriga stood on the Acropolis on the left hand as soon as one had entered the propylaea.

Pp. 109-141. R. Asmus, Kaiser Julians Misopogon und seine Quelle. (Conclusion. See Philol. LXXVII pp. 266-292). The echoes of the Alkibiades in the Misopogon give the impression of a theosophic variation on its theme of "education for dominion." The emperor derives his subject matter indirectly from this dialogue, through Iamblichos' Commentary on the Alkibiades.

Pp. 142-173. F. Eckstein, Syntaktische Beiträge zu Plautus. Even in the fragments of the early Roman comic and tragic writers we find primitive syntax and sentence structure side by side with conscious and artistic use of the methods of Greek rhetoric. Plautus offers more abundant examples. This investigation deals with those sentences in which the poet adopts and imitates a technique in periodic structure typical of the pre-Greek epoch. One peculiarity of the old Roman prose is the use of a principal clause preceded by a series of subordinate clauses in paratactic sequence. Cato's sentences often resemble

those in the fragments of the laws but show greater variety. In Plautus' 21 plays there are 88 sentences that show this piling up of clauses, e. g., Pseud. 372 ff. 72 cases occur in *diverbium* (60 in dialogue, 12 in monologue) and 16 in *cantica*. Clauses with *si* predominate. Plautus, though powerfully affected by the subtle influence of Greek rhetoric, shows himself a genuine Roman who prizes and loves the force and individuality of his own people.

Pp. 174-193. E. Hertlein, Antonius Julianus, ein römischer Geschichtschreiber? (An attempt to explain Minucius Felix, Octavius 33, 2 ff.) Antoni(n)us Julianus appears to have been a Jewish-Roman writer with theological leanings, who lived in the first or second century and of whom we know nothing more. He should no longer be cited as a historian in the old sense of the word, and, especially, should not be used for hypotheses about the sources of Tacitus or Josephus.

MISCELLEN.

Pp. 194-199. H. Pomtow, Pharsalica. I. A. The *anathema* of the Pharsalians at Delphi (Achilles on horseback accompanied by Patroklos on foot) is to be dated 346-344 B. C. The group (cf. Pausan. X 13, 5) would appear to have been a special thank-offering of the city of Pharsalos for the victorious ending of the holy war, in which the Pharsalians, as part of the Thessalian army, played an important rôle. This is shown by the eminent position held at Delphi by their hieromnemes and *naopoioi* after the peace in the following decades. B. The inscribed basis of an equestrian statue found at Delphi (Inventory No. 3198) mentions 'polemarchs' and hence must have been erected before 343 B. C. The group (A) once stood upon it. C. The inscription to the emperor Claudius on the front of the basis (B) shows that the original memorial of the Pharsalians was at that time uninjured, otherwise the basis would have been reversed to receive the inscription. II. Phthiotis and the peace between Philip V and the Aitolians. The difficulties offered by the inscriptions can best be explained by assuming that in the peace of 206 B. C. Philip and the Aitolians in a certain way shared Thessaly. The Aitolians surrendered their claims to the rest of Thessaly on Philip's assurance that he would in return grant them Phthiotis. After the peace he did not fulfill his promise, especially as after his peace with the Romans he saw that the Aitolians could expect no support from them. After the peace the Aitolians claimed three of the four amphictyonic votes of the Thessalians and Achaians, that is, the two of the Achaians and one of the Thessalians. At all events the decrease in the number of votes of the Aitolians might be explained in this way, yet there may be some other explanation.

Pp. 206-208. N. Wecklein, Zu Homer. The epithet of the horse is either ὑψάνχην or ἐριγχής. The MS. reading in E 772 ὑψηχέες like ἐριαύχενες (A 159, K 305, P 496, Σ 280) arose from a confusion of ὑψαύχενες and ἐριγχέες. A similar change occurs in A 292 where the proper epithet of the dog is καρχαρόδοντα.

Pp. 208-213. G. Sommerfeldt. Zur Kritik von Xenophons Λακεδαιμονίων πολιτεία. In c. II 5-6, ἔταξε is a gloss on συνεβούλευεν; ἔχειν is an error for ἐσθίειν; and τὸν ἄρρενα is correct.

Pp. 213-218. E. Kalinka, Tibulls Alter. An argument is made for 60 B. C. or somewhat earlier as the date of Tibullus' birth. He would have been thirty when he was intimate with Plania and we should not expect his poems to present a truthful account of his heart's tragedy.

Pp. 219-227. E. Bickel, Der Schluss der Apokolokyntosis. The extant form of the abrupt ending is defended. The satire, which may have been written at the time Nero annulled the deification of Claudius (Suet. Claud. 45), had both a political and a personal motive. Seneca's ambition and influence as a statesman have probably been underestimated; we must not forget the rise of the Spaniard to imperial power at Rome in the succeeding half-century. Moreover the banishment, brought about by Messalina, Claudius and the freedmen of the court, rankled in Seneca's memory. He punishes Claudius in the lower world by making him for all time a slave, a *cognitionibus*, for in life he had acted as the beadle of the freedmen in his farcical administration of the courts of justice.

Pp. 228-255. O. Lautensach, Grammatische Studien zu den attischen Tragikern und Komikern: Infinitive und Partizipien. Concluded from pp. 46-76.

Pp. 256-310. R. Wagner, Der Berliner Notenpapyrus; nebst Untersuchungen zur rhythmischen Notierung und Theorie. Added is a modern musical transcription. The papyrus (p. 6870), dating from the end of the second or the beginning of the third century after Christ, falls into five sections. A, C, E have text and vocal notation; B and D have only instrumental notation. A contains a fragment of a Paean to Apollo in which the god is celebrated as lord of many shrines, leader of the muses and of song, giver of light, avenger of his mother, and as Pythios(?). The style is late Hellenistic and modeled on the ancient liturgical poetry. C deals with the suicide of Ajax. E seems to be of a tragic nature. Points discussed are: the positions of the musical symbols; the melodies; relation of melody and word-accent; and the time values of the symbols. The fragmentary condition of the pieces makes any aesthetic estimate difficult. A shows traces of a pleasing melodic art; there

is a solemn melody, almost diatonic, with some wide intervals. B is much like A. C has a mournful, trenchant character heightened by the chromatics. D is "a pearl of radiant splendor," a simple melody of sustained, gentle sadness and of charming rhythm, excelling anything that has come down from antiquity. An investigation as to the rhythmical notation and theory reaches the conclusion (p. 310) that ancient theory and practice nowhere actually recognize and presume a rhythmical ictus.

Pp. 311-363. K. Zepernick, *Die Exzerpte des Athenaeus in den Dipnosophisten und ihre Glaubwürdigkeit*. Athenaeus does not arbitrarily change the words of the authors whom he cites; on the contrary, he copies the excerpts with great care. Almost all the errors to be found are for the most part due to such corruptions as are to be met with in great numbers in all mss. Other errors may be explained on the assumption that the epitomator abbreviated excerpts which Athenaeus himself had given with greater completeness. Finally, Athenaeus used copies of Homer, Plato, Theophrastus and others in which different readings and sometimes glosses were offered, from which he sometimes selected a reading not in agreement with the text of these authors as recognized today. Hence, here and there, he preserves a better reading than the prevailing text-tradition, and to such variants the greatest consideration is due.

Pp. 364-379. Fr. Börtzler, *Zum Texte des Johannes Laurentius Lydus "De Mensibus"*. What R. Wünsch (Teub. 1898), like his predecessors, offered as a text of Lydus, is not the pure Lydus, but a conglomerate of Lydus and all sorts of observations of more or less learned and shrewd readers or copyists. The collections of excerpts X, Y, S go back to the same original excerpt. This last again is, apparently, itself worked together out of several excerpts.

Pp. 380-412. J. Schnetz, *Arabien beim Geographen von Ravenna (w. map)*. A critical study of the Arabic names in the anonymous geographer of Ravenna, dating about 700 A. D., who is of the greatest value for the study of the *Tabula Peutingeriana*.

Pp. 413-421. F. Seebass, *Hölderlins Sophocles-Uebersetzungen im zeitgenössischen Urteil*. The high regard of modern scholars for these versions contrasts strangely with the displeasure with which they were received by contemporary critics.

MISCELLEN.

Pp. 422. E. Kieckers, *Zum Gebrauch des Artikels im Griechischen*. Parenthetical phrases of the types $\xi\phi\eta\ \delta\ \text{Κέβης}$ and $\eta\ \delta'\ \delta\ \text{Κέβης}$ require the anaphoric article, which is here equivalent to "the abovenamed"; but in giving a quotation the phrase is simply of the type $\xi\phi\eta\ \text{Ὁμηρος}$.

Pp. 422-425. Fr. Bilabel, Der griechische Name der Stadt El-Hibe. Papyri found by the writer in 1914 in El-Hibe show the Greek name to have been Ἀγκυρῶν (πόλις); but the accent was probably -ών. The word means "anchorage," Stephanus of Byzantium to the contrary.

Pp. 425-427. O. Probst, Lösung zum Rätsel eines Unbekannten. The riddle, in 13 hexameters, publ. by J. Klein (Rhein. Mus. 23 (1868) 662), from a Paris ms. of the eleventh century, might be solved by "*mustela*."

Pp. 427-428. Th. Birt, Zum Königsmimus. Heretofore the sole reference for the existence of such a mime was Philo (against Flaccus, c. 5) of the first century; we must now add Orosius (adv. paganos VII 42) of the fifth. Alaric the Goth, in order to insult Honorius, made Attalus, who was prefect of the city, against his will "anti-emperor," but immediately deposed him: in hoc Alaricus imperatore facto infecto refecto ac defecto, citius his omnibus actis paene quam dictis, *mimum risit et ludum spectavit imperii* nec mirum, si hac pompa miser lusus est e. q. s. The allusion is to some *ludus imperii* which was, as it were, staged by Alaric. The kings of the Saturnalia and the New Year festival were unwilling kings like the Karabas of Philo, or Claudius among the emperors. The mocking of Christ by the soldiers was quite a different procedure for he claimed kingship.

GEORGE DWIGHT KELLOGG.

UNION COLLEGE.

REVIEWS.

De Consolatione Philosophiae. Scripsit Fridericus Klingner (= Philologische Untersuchungen herausgegeben von A. Kiessling und U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, XXVII, 1921), 2 + 120 pp. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1921.

Vivant qui post nos nostra dixere! In a paper published in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* XV (1904) and entitled "On the Composition of Boethius's *Consolatio Philosophiae*," I endeavored to refute Usener's theory that this work, which our ancestors once numbered among the hundred best books, was an unoriginal conflation of two sources, which perhaps Boethius even found already conflated; one was selected from Aristotle's *Προτρεπτικὸς εἰς τὴν φιλοσοφίαν* and the other from some Neoplatonic treatise. I followed through the argument of the *Consolatio* book by book to show the originality of the thought and the art of the composition. I tried also to make clear that while the author constructs his proof from pagan material and couches it in a Ciceronian style, he presents a philosophy in harmony with Christian teaching. Though he undoubtedly shows an acquaintance with the great pagan thinkers of his own age and the centuries immediately preceding him, his ultimate point of view involves not so much an appropriation as a criticism of Neoplatonism. I summed up my meaning in the following words (p. 28):

"The fundamental aim of the work is to make the language of philosophy approach as closely as possible to the meaning of faith; for Boethius was neither a pagan, nor a cold eclectic, nor a dilettante reviser of others' texts, but the first of the scholastics."

This is precisely the programme of Herr Klingner, as the following passages will show:

"Sed id quo fere summa eius disputationis ratio continetur: investigatam a doctoribus ecclesiae quaestionem ad rationes ex intima philosophia sumptas revocat et adcommodat" (p. 97).

"Boethius vero, sicut totam hanc de praescientia et libertate quaestionem a doctorum Christianorum rationibus ad intimam philosophiam vocat, hic quoque a parte Platoniorum stat, ita tamen, ut sententiam eorum cum fide Christiana non pugnare conetur demonstrare" (p. 110).

"A ratione tamen et Aristotelis et Platoniorum Boethius alienus est (in the question of divine foreknowledge), quam-

quam ipsa verba et distinguendi rationem scholasticam, ut ita dicam, ad studium Aristotelis referenda esse crediderim" (p. 111).

"Quo factum est, ut philosophi Christiani quos scholasticos vocant, quippe qui similem universi compagem animo tenerent, melius Boethium intellexerent quam recentiores" (p. 118).

I bear the author no malice for not having read my own statement of this case. On the contrary, it is a satisfaction to find another investigator, working independently, arrive at the same goal. I gladly admit, furthermore, that Klingner's analysis is far more searching than mine. He has bestowed a most illuminating scrutiny on all the ancient sources with which Boethius could by any possibility be acquainted. Plato and Aristotle, Cicero and Seneca, Stoic diatribes and mystic hymns, Neoplatonist and Christian theologians, Virgil and Prudentius, prayers and *protreptikoi* and even the liturgy of the Mass,—these and more are passed before the reader's mind as they may have passed before the mind of the philosopher in his dungeon. Herr Klingner does not imply that Boethius hunted up chapter and verse for each and every appropriation from his predecessors. For the searcher of sources there could hardly seem a less encouraging field than the *Consolatio Philosophiae*. We know where the author wrote it and he tells us that his library, greatly to his grief, was not with him. And yet the parallels in thought and phrase that Klingner points out are too significant to be lightly brushed aside. We are therefore given an insight into the philosopher's memory and powers of construction and reconstruction. The originality of the work gains enormously when we look at it from this point of view. Both thought and form are original. The work, as nobody has made so plain before, is an apocalypse, of the general type of the *Poimandres* of "Hermes Trismegistus," but an apocalypse combined with Menippean satire, Stoic diatribe and Platonic dialogue with so delicate a skill that like all great works of art it transcends the categories and itself stands forth almost as a new literary type.

I will not stop for the few details in which I am of a different opinion from that of the author. He has given Boethius's masterpiece its proper setting in the literary and philosophical movements of antiquity, with an intelligent glance at the influence of the work on the coming centuries. In particular, he makes clearer the reasons for Dante's devotion to the *Consolatio* and proves it an indispensable guide to the understanding of the *Divine Comedy*. All in all, this is the most important work that has appeared about Boethius for years. It ought to restore the *Consolatio Philosophiae* to its place on the five-foot shelf.

E. K. RAND.

Vitae Patrum: Kritische Untersuchungen über Text, Syntax und Wortschatz der spätleinischen *Vitae Patrum* (B. III, V, VI, VII), von Dr. A. H. Saloniua. (= Skrifter utgivna av Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund. II) Lund, C. W. K. Gleerup; London, Humphrey Milford; Oxford, University Press; Paris, Ed. Champion; Leipzig, O. Harrassowitz. 1920, pp. xi, 456.

Passio S. Perpetuae: Kritische Bemerkungen mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der griechisch-lateinischen Überlieferung des Textes, von A. H. Saloniua. (= Översikt av Finska Vetenskaps-Societetens Förhandlingar. Bd. LXIII. 1920-21. Avd. B. N:o 2.) Helsingfors 1921, Helsingfors Centraltryckeri och Bokbinderi Aktiebolag; New York, Lemcke & Buechner. Pp. iv. 80.

Die Ursachen der Geschlechtsverschiedenheit von *dies*, von A. H. Saloniua. (= Översikt av Finska Vetenskaps-Societetens Förhandlingar. Bd. LXIV. 1921-22. Avd. B. N:o 1.) Helsingfors 1921, Helsingfors Centraltryckeri; New York, Lemcke & Buechner.

For a generation now, a little group of Latin scholars up by the Baltic have been publishing valuable investigations, particularly in late Latin. Ahlberg, Ahlquist, Sjögren and especially Löfstedt, have distinguished themselves. Now Löfstedt's pupil Saloniua, of the University of Helsingfors, has brought out three important studies, which should be available to everyone interested in Latin historical syntax and vocabulary.

In his "*Vitae Patrum*," Saloniua expressly disclaims any attempt to rival Bonnet, FriebeI or Müller-Marquardt; he confines himself to syntax and vocabulary. As he had to use the old Rosweyde edition, as reproduced in Migne (P. L. 73), any accurate discussion of forms was out of the question; and this insecurity of text troubles him throughout. Of interesting syntactical discussions, I would note those of the genitive of quality superseding the ablative; besides the *ablativus comparationis*, the use of genitive, dative and prepositions (cf. Fr. plus *de* quatre); *misereri* with the dative; *esse ad* = *ire ad*, as in Spanish; the use of adjectives instead of adverbs (on which, as he says, an exhaustive study is sorely needed); the comparative *plurior* (Fr. *plusieurs*); compound prepositions, e. g. *de foris* (Fr. *dehors*), *de intro* (It. and Sp. *dentro*), *de sursum* (Fr. *dessus*) etc.; pronouns as articles; *ab invicem*; *opus habeo*, *necesse habeo*, *necessarius sum* = *opus est*; *habeo* + *inf.* =

future; replacement of acc. + inf. by a clause; indicative in indirect questions; nam = sed, autem; quod temporal; nisi quia, nisi quod (Port. nega, nego); ut and quatenus causal; and a very valuable lexicon of striking late Latin words found in these Lives, e. g.: appropriare; buda; capitium; caricare; causa = res; civitas = urbs; colligere; domesticus = amicus; dorsum domus; egestuosus; extaediari; facere = sibi parare; facere an = agere; focalis = Fr. foyer; habere (annos etc.); odio habere aliquem for the missing tenses of odi; instanter = constanter; imperative of iubere + infinitive = imperative; magnus, grandis; medietas, medius; mittere = ponere; modicus = parvus; praesumere = Eng. presume; relinquere = permittere; repausare; res = vestimenta, as in English; tenere; tollere, ferre; veteramenta; zippulae—all these and many others with a wealth of illustration from other sources; it needs no word of mine to point out their importance to the student of Romance languages as well. There is a good bibliography and index; misprints are rare.

The two lesser treatises are first, an attempt to prove that the Passio S. Perpetuae is a translation from the Greek into Latin, and not, as most scholars have tried to show, the reverse; here Salonius takes many passages and with much ingenuity and erudition makes out a pretty good case; and second, a discussion of what exercised even the ancients themselves: when and why is dies feminine? Salonius inclines to believe that the opposite nox (and later, the synonym lux) brought about the change from the original masculine. I must confess this method proves too much or too little; it seems far simpler to me to accept the most obvious factor (which Salonius also mentions, of course)—that almost all fifth declension nouns are feminine. That is always powerful; witness the South and Pennsylvania German, *der Butter*.

In closing, it is a pleasure to testify to the solid, substantial work of this young Finnish scholar. He will theorize less as he grows older.

CHARLES UPSON CLARK.

NORTH HATLEY, QUEBEC.

VLADIMIRO ZABUGHIN. Vergilio nel Rinascimento Italiano, da Dante a Torquato Tasso: Fortuna, studi, imitazioni, traduzioni e parodie, iconografia. Volume primo: Il Trecento ed il Quattrocento (con 18 tavole fuori testo). Bologna: Zanichelli, 1921. xxv + 345 pp.

This first volume of Professor ZABUGHIN's new book is a worthy companion to Comparetti's Vergil in the Middle Ages.

The Introduction (pp. 1-106) deals mainly with Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio—their knowledge of Vergil's poems, their imitations of them, and their opinions of Vergil as a poet and as a man. It treats also of the fourteenth-century commentaries of Benvenuto da Imola, Zono de Magnalis, Giovanni da Firenze, and others. Some of the matters much discussed at this time were Vergil's treatment of Dido, Vergil as a magician, and Vergil as a prophet of Christ.

The first chapter (pp. 107-148) deals with the anti-humanists of the fifteenth century, their hostility toward Vergil, and the defense of the poet by Salutati, Pierpaolo Vergerio, Guarino, and the rest. The second and third chapters (pp. 149-230) take up the Lives of Vergil, ancient and modern, and the commentaries on his poems from Servius down to the end of the fifteenth century. The fourth and fifth chapters (pp. 231-345) discuss the fifteenth-century imitations of the *Bucolics* and of the *Aeneid*—the best of them, the Latin eclogues of Jacopo Sannazaro and Antonio Geraldini, the *Porcaria* of Horatius Romanus, and the *Hesperis* of Basinio of Parma.

Professor ZABUGHIN's book is based upon a vast amount of study and research, and it is always interesting, though his arrangement of text and notes makes it rather hard reading. One statement should perhaps be modified, p. 85, n. 165. Here the passage in the Seventh book of Petrarch's *Africa* where Carthage and Rome appear before Jupiter, and appeal to him, is called a free imitation of *Aen.* IV 90-128. It might remind one rather of the debate between Venus and Juno in the Tenth book of the *Aeneid*. But the particular thing which Petrarch had in mind was probably a passage at the beginning of Claudian's *De Bello Gildonico*, where Rome and Africa appeal to Jupiter. See this Journal, XLII 120.

W. P. MUSTARD.

Basinii Parmensis Poetae Liber Isottaëus. A cura di FERRUCCIO FERRI. Città di Castello: Società Anonima Tipografica 'Leonardo da Vinci,' 1922. xxvii + 101 pp.

Students of the Latin poetry of the Renaissance will be interested in this new edition of the Liber Isottaëus of Basinio of Parma. This is a romance in epistolary form, composed of thirty very readable elegies which deal with the loves of Sigismondo Pandolfo Malatesta and Isotta degli Atti di Rimini. The chief model is, of course, Ovid, but one of the poems (ii. 2) shows plainly that the author had been reading Cicero's First *Tusculan*. American libraries should secure the book promptly, as it has been published in a limited edition.

The authorship of some of these elegies has been ascribed to various fifteenth-century poets, but Professor FERRI seems to have made it clear that they should all be ascribed to a single writer. Basinio was born in 1425. He studied at Mantua, under Vittorino, and about 1444 he passed on to Ferrara. There he studied Greek under Theodorus Gaza, and Latin under Guarino. In 1448 he was appointed to teach Latin at Ferrara; in 1450, at Rimini. He died in 1457.

W. P. MUSTARD.

(P. Vergili Maronis) *Epigrammata et Priapea*. Édition critique et explicative, par EDOUARD GALLETTIER. Paris: Hachette, 1920. xvi + 229 pp.

This is a study of some of the shorter poems traditionally ascribed to Vergil. It gives the Latin text, with an introduction (70 pp.), textual notes (57 pp.), and a commentary (94 pp.).

Professor GALLETTIER rejects the title 'Catalepton,' as used to cover both *Priapea* and *Epigrammata*. He suggests that it is due to a misunderstanding of a statement of Suetonius—who may have written something like "deinde fecit κατὰ λεπτὸν *Priapea*, *Epigrammata*, *Diras*, item *Cirin* et *Culicem*." As for the authorship of the poems, he refers them to different writers, and different periods. The second and third *Priapea* seem to come from the last quarter of the first century B.C.; the first is much later. Of the *Epigrams*, no. 5, 'Ite hinc, inanes' (c. 50 B.C.), no. 7, 'Si licet hoc' (after the year 38), no. 8, 'Villula, quae' (39), and perhaps no. 10, 'Sabinus ille' (between 50 and 40), are the authentic work of Vergil. Some of them were written by contemporaries of Vergil, who were perhaps also his compatriots: no. 2, 'Corinthiorum amator' (43), nos. 6, 12 and 1 (which come from the same poet), and no. 13, 'Iacere me' (c. 20). Three others are the work of a single poet, who was attached to the circle of Messalla: no. 4, 'Quocumque ire,' no. 11, 'Quis deus, Octavi' (after the year 35), and no. 9, 'Pauca mihi' (27). No. 14, 'Si mihi susceptum,' and no. 3, 'Aspice quem,' were written after the death of Vergil. No. 15, 'Vate Syracosio,' may be referred to the third or fourth century.

W. P. MUSTARD.

ÉDOUARD GALLETTIER. *Étude sur la poésie funéraire romaine d'après les inscriptions*. Paris: Hachette, 1922. xiii + 342 pp. 25 fr.

This is not exactly a cheerful subject, but Professor GALLETTIER has written a delightful book. It is a work of 'vulgarisa-

tion'—a word which somehow looks much better in French than it does in its English form. It discusses the Roman poetical epitaph as an indication of religious or philosophical belief (pp. 5-92), as a source of information on social or family life (93-188), and as literature (189-319). To the literary parallels cited one might add, on p. 26, Lucretius, V 259, *omniparens eadem rerum commune sepulcrum*, or Lucan, VII 818, *capit omnia tellus, | quae genuit*.

W. P. MUSTARD.

C. Plini Caecili Secundi Epistularum libri decem. Recensuit
ELMER TRUESDELL MERRILL. Leipsic, Teubner, 1922.
xxiv + 315 pp. \$1.90.

The publication of this important critical edition was sadly delayed by the Great War. It should therefore be mentioned very promptly here, although any serious discussion of it must be left for a more competent reviewer. The Introduction is concerned mainly with the tradition of Pliny's Letters from the time of their first appearance down to the era of the early printed editions. Most of it had already been printed, in an English form, in *Classical Philology*, X 8-25. The apparatus criticus is laudably complete. There are a few misprints: p. 170, l. 21, *repentundarum*; 171, 25, *sementi*; 174, 5, *neccessitatem*; 178, 7 and 8, *quosque*, for *quousque*; 207, 13, *amibitio*; 217, 24, *quiae*, for *quia*; 280, 9, *preest*; 282, 7, *accomodator*; 286, 29, *epistula*, for *epistulae*.

W. P. MUSTARD.

CORRESPONDENCE

Columbia University, N. Y., February 10, 1923.

Editor of American Journal of Philology,

Dear Sir:

Plans have finally been perfected for reviving the two important Germanistic *Jahresberichte*, suspended by the war. Each is to include twelve "Bogen" and their surveys of literature will divide at the year 1700. The *Jahresb. f. german. Philologie* will continue to be issued by the Berlin Gesellschaft f. deutsche Philologie under Professor Roethe's editorship. The number for 1920 is now in the press, that for 1921 in preparation. The *Jahresb. f. neuere deutsche Literaturwissenschaft* has been taken over by the Berlin Literatur-Archiv-Gesellschaft, under Professor Petersen's editorship. The *Berichtsjahr 1921* is in preparation and will appear this year, leaving the gap 1916-1920 to

be filled by a special volume, to be issued later. It will be somewhat modified as compared with its predecessor down to 1915, and will cover literature down to the present day. The general business management is in the hands of Professor F. Behrend, Archivar of the Deutsche Kommission of the Berlin Academy of Sciences, Unter den Linden 38.

Both societies solicit membership from American scholars and libraries. Membership in either costs \$2.00 for 1923, which includes a copy of the Berichtsjahr 1921. The *Jahresb. f. germ. Phil.* for 1920 will be purchasable separately at \$2.00. The Literatur-Archiv-Gesellschaft offers members the current number of its Mitteilungen (*Das Literatur-Archiv*¹) as an alternative for the *Jahresbericht*, or with it for \$1 additional. It has also earlier sets of its publications from the Archiv to sell directly.

Subscribers to both societies may forward their names and options to the Emergency Society for German and Austrian Science and Art—c. of Professor Franz Boas, Columbia University, New York—which will attend to the delivery of the volumes when published. Immediate payment is desirable, but may be deferred till receipt of the volume. Subscription to membership insures receipt of the publication at a reduced price and is important for those who wish to maintain their files intact, as under present conditions there is no certainty that a sufficient number of copies will be available for later purchase through trade channels.

Review copies of works published in this country should be forwarded to Professor Behrend, marked for the editor. This is very important, in order that the bibliography may include all American contributions to Germanics.

Respectfully yours,

THE AMERICAN COMMITTEE,
per Robert Herndon Fife.

¹Under this name it is planned to open a new series of publications from the Archiv's manuscript material. The first two years of the Series will continue the letters of Elise Reimarus to Hennings.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Allen (James T.) *The Orchestra-Terrace of the Aeschylean Theater.* Berkeley, *University of California Press*, 1922. (University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 121-128.)

Ammann (Hermann). *Untersuchungen zur homerischen Wortfolge und Satzstruktur mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Stellung des Verbuns. Erster, allgemeiner Teil.* Freiburg i. B., *Julius Boltze*, 1922. Pp. 47.

Aristotelis *Topica* cum libro *de Sophisticis Elenchis*. E schedis Ioannis Strache edidit Maximilianus Wallies. (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana.) Leipsic, *B. G. Teubner*, 1923. 251 pp. \$2.60, in paper cover.

Austin (James Curtiss). *The Significant Name in Terence.* Urbana, *Published by the University of Illinois Press*. (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. VII, No. 4, November 1921.) Pp. 130. \$2.

Behrens (Hugo). *Untersuchungen über das anonyme Buch de Viris Illustribus.* Heidelberg, *Carl Winter*, 1923. 71 pp. \$1.

Bell (Clair Hayden). *The Sister's Son in the Medieval German Epic. A Study in the Survival of Matriliney.* Berkeley, *University of California Press*, 1922. (University of California Publications in Modern Philology, Vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 67-182.)

Burk (August). *Die Pädagogik des Isokrates als Grundlegung des humanistischen Bildungsideals.* (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums, Bd. XII, Hft. 3-4.) Pp. viii + 231. Würzburg, *Univ.-Professor Dr. Drerup* (Hofpromenade 1), 1923. Agents for U. S., *G. E. Stechert & Co.*, New York.

Clark (Gifford Foster). *The Case-Construction after the Comparative in Pliny's Letters.* Northampton, Mass., 1922. (Smith College Classical Studies, No. 3.) Pp. viii + 26.

Claudian with an English translation by Maurice Platnauer. Vols. I-II. (The Loeb Classical Library.) London, *William Heinemann*; New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1922. \$2.25 each.

Dante Alighieri. *La vita nuova*, edited with introduction, notes, and vocabulary by Kenneth McKenzie. Boston, New York, Chicago, *D. C. Heath & Co.*, 1922. Pp. xxvi + 172.

Drerup (Engelbert). *Demosthenes im Urteile des Altertums.* Würzburg, *Univ.-Professor Dr. Drerup* (Hofpromenade 1), 1923. (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums, Bd. 12, Hft. 1 und 2.) Pp. 264.

Epicurus. *Epistulae tres et ratae sententiae.* Edidit Von der Muehl. Lipsiae, *B. G. Teubner*, 1922. \$.38. Pp. x + 69.

Eroticorum Graecorum Fragmenta Papyracea. Primus collegit recensuit Latina interpretatione ditavit verborum indices addidit Bruno Lavagnini. (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana.) Leipsic, *B. G. Teubner*, 1922. 48 pp. 50 cts. in paper cov.

Estudios. Año 1, Nos. 2 and 3. Panama, Sepbre. y Octubre; Nov. y Diciembre, 1922.

Frazer (Sir James George). *The Golden Bough. A Study in Magic and Religion.* New York, *Macmillan Company*, 1922. Pp. xiv + 752. \$5.00.

Galletier (Edouard). *Étude sur la poésie funéraire romaine d'après les inscriptions*. Paris, *Librairie Hachette*, 1922. Pp. xiii + 340. 25 fr.

— (P. Vergili Maronis) *Epigrammata et Priapea*. Édition critique et explicative. Paris, *Librairie Hachette*, 1920. Pp. xvi + 226. 10 fr.

Harrer (G. A.) *The Chronology of the Revolt of Pescennius Niger*. (Reprinted from the *Journal of Roman Studies*, 1920, pp. 155-168. [Published October, 1922].)

Herodianus. *Ab excessu D. Marci libri VIII*. Edidit K. Stavenhagen. Lipsiae, *B. G. Teubner*, 1922. Pp. xii + 235.

Hespéris. *Archives Berbères et Bulletin de l'Institut des Hautes-Études Marocaines*. Tome II. 1er-2e Trimestres. Paris, *Émile Larose*, 1922.

Howard (Albert Andreas) and Jackson (Karl Newell). *Index verborum C. Suetoni Tranquilli stilique eius proprietatum nonnullarum*. Cambridge, *Harvard University Press*, 1922. Pp. 273.

Irvine (A. L.) *KTHMA EE AEI*. London, *Humphrey Milford*, 1922. Pp. vi + 157. \$1.35.

Jacks (Leo V.) *St. Basil and Greek Literature*. Diss. of Catholic University of America. Washington, *Catholic University of America*. (The Catholic University of America, Patristic Studies, Vol. I.) Pp. 123.

Journal of Education and School World. October and November, 1922. London, *William Rice*.

Kahrstedt (Ulrich). *Griechisches Staatsrecht*. Erster Band, *Sparta und seine Symmachie*. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht*, 1922. Pp. xii + 443. New York, *Lemcke & Buechner*, 32 E. 20th St.

Kretzmann (Paul Edward). *The Liturgical Element in the Earliest Forms of the Medieval Drama with Special Reference to the English and German Plays*. Minneapolis, 1916. (University of Minnesota Studies in Language and Literature, No. 4.) Pp. vii + 170. \$1.00.

Lindsay (W. M.) *Julian of Toledo "De Vitiis et Figuris"*. Critical edition. New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1922. (St. Andrews University Publications, No. XV.) Pp. 42. 85 cents.

Lindsay (W. M.) *Palaeographia Latina*. Part I. New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1922. Pp. 66. (St. Andrews University Publications, XIV.) \$1.70.

Lowe (E. A.) and Rand (E. K.) *A Sixth-Century Fragment of the Letters of Pliny the Younger*. Pp. vi + 67. xx plates. Washington, *Carnegie Institution of Washington*, 1922.

Mackail (J. W.) *Virgil and His Meaning to the World of To-Day*. Boston, *Marshall Jones Company*, 1922. (Our Debt to Greece and Rome, 15.)

Nutting (H. C.) *The Si-Clause in Substantive Use*. Berkeley, Cal., *University of California Press*, 1922. (Un. of Cal. Publications in Classical Philology, Vol. VII, No. 3, pp. 129-142.)

Octavia praetexta cum elementis commentarii edidit Carolus Hosius. Bonn, *A. Marcus und E. Weber's Verlag*, 1922. (Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen, 147.) Pp. 72. \$45.

Personalist (The). Vol. III, No. 4. October 1922. Los Angeles, *University of Southern California*.

Peters (Heinrich). *Zur Einheit der Ilias*. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht*, 1922. Pp. 139. \$1.20.

Philological Quarterly. Vol. I, No. 4. October 1922. Iowa City, *Published at the University of Iowa*.

Photographs of Manuscripts. Reports from His Majesty's Representatives abroad respecting Facilities for obtaining Photographs of Manuscripts in Public Libraries in certain Foreign Countries. London, *Printed & Published by His Majesty's Stationery Office*, 1922. Pp. 28. 1s.

Poutsma (H.) The Infinitive, the Gerund and the Participles of the English Verb. Groningen, *P. Noordhoff*, 1923. Pp. 240. 4.50 frs.; bound 5.50 frs.

Prickard (A. O.) Una forcatella di spine. Notes chiefly on the "Ars Poetica" of Horace. Winchester, *Printed by Warren and Sons, Ltd.*, 1922. Pp. 31. 1s. 6d.

Propertius (Sextus). Die Elegien. Erklärt von Max Rothstein. Erster Teil. Erstes u. zweites Buch. Zweite Auflage. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1920. 500 pp. 12°. 40 cts. in paper cover.

— — — Elegiarum libri IV. Iterum edidit Carolus Hosius. Lipsiae, *B. G. Teubner*, 1922. (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana.) xxiv + 190 pp.

Radermacher (L.) Aristophanes' Frösche. Einleitung, Text, und Kommentar. Wien, *Alfred Hölder*, 1922. (Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Phil.-hist. Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, 198. Bd., 4. Abt.) Pp. 364.

Ritter (Otto). Vermischte Beiträge zur englischen Sprachgeschichte, Etymologie, Ortsnamenkunde, Lautlehre. Halle, *Max Niemeyer*, 1922. Pp. xi + 219.

Robinson (Rodney Potter). De fragmenti Suetoniani de Grammaticis et Rhetoribus Codicum Nexu et Fide. Urbana, *Published by the University of Illinois Press*. (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. VI, No. 4, November 1920.) Pp. 195. \$2.

Sedgefield (W. J.) An Anglo-Saxon Verse-Book. Manchester, *At the University Press*, 1922. Pp. viii + 248.

Showerman (Grant). Horace and His Influence. Boston, *Marshall Jones Company*, 1922. (Our Debt to Greece and Rome, 14.) xvii + 176 pp. \$1.50.

Smith (Henrie). A Frvttfvl Sermon vpon part of the 5. Chapter of the First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Thessalonians. Republished by H. T. Price. Halle, *Max Niemeyer*, 1922. Pp. xxxii + 41.

Svennung (Josef). Orosiana. Syntaktische semasiologische und kritische Studien zu Orosius. Uppsala, *A.-B. Akademiska Bokhandeln*, 1922. Pp. xi + 201.

Symbolae Arctoeae. Fasc. I. Edidit Societas Philologica Christianensis. Christiania, *H. Erichsen & Co.*, 1922. 86 pp. 8°.

Taylor (Henry Osborn). Greek Biology and Medicine. Boston, *Marshall Jones Company*, 1922. (Our Debt to Greece and Rome, 35.)

University of Wales—Prifysgol Cymru. The Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies. Vol. I, Part III. November 1922. London, *New York, Oxford University Press*. Price 7s. 6d. net.

Vincent (Auguste). L'Escaut. Étude toponymique. Bruxelles, *Imprimerie Médicale & Scientifique*, 1922. Pp. 20. (Extrait de la Revue de l'Université de Bruxelles, nos. 7-8, Avril-Mai 1922.)

Weber (Valentin). Des Paulus Reiserouten bei der zweimaligen Durchquerung Kleinasiens. Würzburg, *C. J. Becker*, 1920. Pp. 41.

— — — Grundsäulen der Kritik des neuen Testamentes? Würzburg, *C. J. Becker*, 1922. Pp. 46.